The American Ecclesiastical Review

VOL. CXXVI, No. 2 FEBRUARY, 1952

CONTENTS

The Priest and the Missions ... *Bishop Fulton John Sheen* 81

Wanted: A Code of Political Ethics ... *Maurice Stephen Sheehy* 87

The Apologetics of the Man Born Blind ... *John W. Moran, S.J.* 90

Our Lady and Our Times ... *Thomas Philippe, O.P.* 97

Interrogation of the Woman Party in the *Super rato* Process ... *John R. Schmidt* 109

A Quest of Thoughts. Part II ... *John K. Ryan* 120

Reform and Integralism ... *Joseph Clifford Fenton* 126

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Breviary Difficulties ... 140

Mass in Thanksgiving ... 140

Incensation at the Altar ... 140

Choir Regulations ... 141

Sacristy Problem ... 141

Anniversary Mass ... 142

(Contents Continued on Next Page)

Published monthly by The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C. Subscription price in U. S. currency or equivalent: United States, Canada, $5.00; Foreign, $5.00; 50 cents per copy.

Entered as second class matter, November 30, 1944, at the Post Office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Accepted for mailing at the special rate of postage provided for under Act of March 5, 1930, under Act of February 28, 1925.

Business communications, including subscriptions and changes of address, should be addressed to The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C.

Please address all manuscripts and editorial correspondence to The Editor, The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.

Copyright 1952, by The Catholic University of America Press

(*Contents Continued from Previous Page*)

Leonine Prayers 142
Choice of Office 143
Midnight Masses 143
Improving the Morality of Television 144
The *Ordo* for Religious 144
The Endurance of a Precept 145

ANALECTA 147

BOOK REVIEWS
St. Benedict and His Times, *by Cardinal Schuster* 153
Meditations for Every Day, *by P. J. Sontag, S.J.* 155
Elizabeth Bayley Seton, *by Annabelle M. Melville* 156
An Introduction to Ancient Philosophy, *by A. H. Armstrong* 158

THE FATHERHOOD OF ST. JOSEPH

By JOSEPH MUELLER, S.J.

Translated by ATHANASIUS DENGLER, O.S.B.

$3.50

What is the essence of marriage? Was St. Joseph really married to the Blessed Virgin, so that he may be truly said to be her husband? The Gospels use the expression, "the father of Jesus." In what sense may these words be applied to St. Joseph? Should he be called "legal father," "foster father," "adoptive father"?

In the present volume, devoted to these two questions, the author's views are based on the most eminent theologians and exegetes in the Church. By way of supplement there is added the consideration of the patronage of St. Joseph and the sort of veneration that is due him.

February selection Spiritual Book Associates

At your bookstore or from

B. HERDER BOOK COMPANY

15 & 17 So. Broadway **St. Louis 2, Mo.**

THE PRIESTS AND THE MISSIONS

When most people, even non-Catholics, use the word "priest," they preface it by the glorious title of "Catholic." To be Catholic means to be universal, and to be universal is to be missionary. One must distinguish in every priest his jurisdiction and his vocation. For purposes of administration, he functions within a certain community or diocese, but his vocation is to the whole world. Of the two, the vocation is primary because the priest is called to mediate between God and man. For practical purposes he circumscribes his activity within a certain area and a particular group. He works from the circumference to the center, that is, from the world to his parish, rather than from the parish to the world. His interest in the pagans of China, India, and Africa is not an afterthought, a superfluity or an extra added to his parochial zeal; if he is not first interested in the Church universal, he will have little interest either in his parish or his community. As St. Thomas says: "The final cause is first in order of intention and last in order of execution." The intention is mondial, that is, the bringing of all souls to Christ; the execution of this plan is particular, geographical and diocesan.

Since the priest must work from the world to his parish, from the cosmos to his diocese, it follows that he is committed to giving the Church a double growth; a conquest from without, and an increase from within. "Increase and multiply" was the Old Testament expression of: "Going therefore teach ye all nations." The priest in his parish and the bishop in a diocese where the Church is planted, have not a *hortus conclusus,* but a *fulcrum* from which they can lift the areas yet to be evangelized. The home parish is not a possession to be enjoyed, but rather a stewardship for transmitting and propagating the faith.

Israel, at the time of Our Lord, was the perfect example of narrow parochialism which had no interest in the expansion of its life beyond its frontiers. Therefore it became the barren Fig Tree. It made itself only a receiving, but not a transmitting station. What was received was not passed on, but buried in a napkin. He who would interdict the vital forces of Christ's Gospel and believe that, like the priest and the levite on the road to Jericho, he must care only for his parish, will find that in the end the parish will be dying

of its own too much, and without any hope of future progeny. Life that is not cradled for growth, is coffined for decay. Impounding to its own interests what is actually a trust, it becomes guilty of misappropriating the riches of the Gospel. Unless the highways to the foreign lands are kept open in every parish, it will be discovered that the foes are of one's own household.

As in the seed of Abraham all nations were to be blessed, so in every established parish the missions are to be blessed. He who will not allow the pagans who pass by on the other side of the diocesan walls to pluck the surplus overhanging fruit will find that his fruit will lose its sweetness. Israel would have kept God to itself, despite the universal summons of the prophets; the diocese that would keep Christ to itself despite the missionary imperative, will find the faith declining because not even the universe can contain His riches. Zeal that is not missionary becomes moribund.

Of all the trees, the one which was chosen most generally by poets to symbolize sorrow was the yew tree, because it did not bloom. Blossom is the sign of hope, the promise of new life in the orchards, the potency of richer fruits in other lands. The priest who thinks first of the Church and then the parish, is like the tree with a fragrant expression of life's loyalty to Propagation, and not like the poetic yew tree which scruples at fulfilling its stewardship.

If there be not sufficient vitality for both life and fruit, the tree has to choose, as it were, between living unto itself and being disloyal to the law of reproduction. Such trees "prefer" to die. If they cannot be missionary, they perish; if they cannot serve the Propaganda, they die. If nature is so lavish and so intent in redeeming the earth from barrenness, then shall the priest, who is called "father," be remiss in having a progeny "from every tribe and nation and tongue"?

There is no priest in any parish where the Church is established, who has not come into an inheritance that was founded on sacrifice. Therefore he must not be recreant to his duty to make a sacrifice for other parishes in other lands; to claim heirship and default in stewardship would make him an unworthy successor of "blood and sweat and tears." To be missionary is one with being sacrificial. Since the parish had its remote beginnings in sacrifice, it may not now in luxury dispense itself from the lance and the spear and the crown of thorns, but rather must summon forth new sacrifices for

new parishes in lands yet to acknowledge Christ the King. To enjoy the fruits of other pastors' sacrifice, and not to sacrifice for the begetting of new pastors in missionary lands, would be to disown a charge which Christ Himself said cannot be disowned.

Each priest in *intention* must start with the love of Christ's Mystical Body in its totality, and in *execution* must put himself under perpetual self-rebuke to drink of the sacrificial cup, that lands walking in darkness may stumble to the light. Only by sacrifice do we hand on the torch to other lands, and thus vindicate our right to have and to hold the possessions we enjoy.

The priest will have a deep passionate interest in the missions for the following reasons:

The priest today happens to be living in a period of the world's history where the power is shifting from the West to the East. Ever since the day that Alexander did battle with Darius, in the first war between Europe and Asia, culture and civilization have been for the most part Occidental. First it was Greek and Roman; then, baptized in Christ, it produced Christian culture. The progress of the West has been due to the leaven of Christianity. Even scientific progress is almost exclusively Western. Science did not arise in the East, and could not, because the East lacked that discipline of mind, and that sacramental outlook on matter, which the Gospel of Christ alone gives to the cosmos.

But now the East is coming into its own. Perhaps some new battle will be fought, reversing the battle of Alexander and Darius; and conceivably it could be fought on Persian plains, with oil as the prize. But however the manner of transfer, the sceptre of political power, world influence, and economic wealth, is passing from the West to the East. The priest who knows this, sees that this is a missionary problem, first and foremost. What the East will be when it comes into its own depends entirely upon how the West prepares it for the advent of its supremacy. Africa that is won to the faith now, will be Christian in the day of its flowering, and not Moslem or Communist. The same is true of the other countries of the East. The priest who knows that he must instruct little children in the Way of Christ in order that the family of the next generation will mirror forth Nazareth, also knows that the young East, for it is young in the sense that its future is before it, must be evangelized, if the world of the future is to dwell in comparative peace and pros-

perity. The political future of the world is inseparable from the missionary present. The harvest fields are greater now than ever in the past, and the priest who is conscious of the Kingship of Christ will scatter his seeds of prayer and sacrifice beyond the narrow limits of his parish, unto the uttermost bounds of the earth. To be neglectful of the East today is like being improvident about tomorrow, for the whole tide of civilization is Eastward. The physical sun rises in the East and sets in the West, but the spiritual Light of the World which is now in the West, is running its course in the opposite direction to the sun. As the waters of history rapidly flow down the river of time to wash the Eastern shores of the universe, let the priest not be recreant to launching the bark of Peter upon those waters, that the East may see Christ walking not only on the waters of Genesereth, but also on the Ganges and the Euphrates.

A second fact that will stir the priest today is the theological one, that there is, as St. Paul says, no remission of sins without the shedding of blood. Sin does get into the blood, even into all the gateways and alleys of the body and brain itself. The alcoholic, the libertine, the deceiver, all of these have their sins written in their own blood. To get rid of sin is therefore, to some extent, to shed blood. Hence when Our Lord came to the last act of His Drama of Redemption, He Who "made Himself sin" poured out His Blood, in reparation for the sins of the world. He also willed that never again should men shed one another's blood to rid themselves of guilt. If they fell from grace, they were to invoke not the blood of lambs and bullocks and goats, but the Blood of the Immaculate Lamb.

Somehow or other, men have forgotten to call upon the Blood of the Lamb. But instinctively they know that without the shedding of blood there is no remission of sins. Instead of invoking the Blood of Christ for peace and reconciliation, they shed one another's blood in the dirty business of war. As sin multiplies throughout the world, the blood of the millions of just Abels shed by the Soviet Cains, clamors to heaven for vengeance. War will go on, and cannon will vomit forth death, and the earth will be sprinkled with blood, unless the Church can succeed in establishing new oases of spirituality in mission lands, multiply the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass and summon people to call daily upon the Blood of the Lamb to save them from their sins. The elimination of war is a missionary problem, and this

is another aspect of the problem which only the priest can understand. He who each day lifts a chalice and says over it the words "in remissionem peccatorum" knows that the multiplication of those chalices and those consecration words alone will hold off the shedding of human blood. Only one per cent of China, of Korea and India, and only one quarter of one per cent of Japan, have the faith and invoke the Blood of the Lamb. This is not enough to create a leaven to prevent war. But the priest who makes sacrifices, and does penances for the missions, and preaches about them from the pulpit, and inspires his people to multiply chapels throughout mission lands, will be doing something really constructive for the peace of the world. St. Paul told his people: "You have not yet resisted unto blood." Such resistance to evil is a long cry from what we are doing now to spread the faith and crush the red cobras of evil. A new fire, a more burning passion, a widening of world consciousness, a lengthening of our arms, and unloosening of our purse strings, a prolongation of our prayers—all these are part of that increasing resistance to evil through sprinkling of the Blood of the Lamb in whose pastures we have the honor to graze.

Finally, the priest will be mission-minded because of his vocation as an Ambassador of Christ. He will recall that Our Lord when He was born called both the home and the foreign missions to Himself; the shepherds symbolizing the home Missions, and the Magi, the Foreign. He will never forget either that Our Lord, when He began the Drama of Redemption on Calvary, permitted Himself to be stripped of His garments which identified Him with one country, one race and one people, in order that He might appear as Man before men, or better still, as the Universal Man summoning all nations and tribes and tongues to Himself. The priest who prolongs Calvary in the Mass clothes himself in universal garments of the universal Church which marks him off from his diocese, his country and his origin, to remind him that he is a missionary to the world and that his interests in the Church are universal. As he offers the chalice at the Altar, he lowers it and traces the four corners of the universe over the corporal. Swinging the chalice north, south, east, and west, he commits himself to the universality of redemption; his heart goes out in the direction of his hands to Oceania, China, Ceylon, Vietnam and all the lands awaiting the redemption of the Saviour. The very words he pronounces, "et totius mundi salute,"

separate him from that narrowness of vision which would think only of the sheep in his own pasture, and makes him look to the hungry ones in the mission fields wandering without a shepherd.

The priest too will recall that when Our Lord ascended into heaven, an angel appeared and said to the Apostles: "Why stand ye here looking up into the heavens?" So we priests, why stand we looking up, when we ought to look out to the mission fields? Heaven is for those who have earned it. While there are talents in our hands, we must go abroad in the earth and earn more talents. Heaven is for those who have finished their course and finished their work; but while we have life there is no abstention from labor. The Lord is sending us out as witnesses to Jerusalem, Samaria and to the "ends of the earth." Thibet is worth a look; Nigeria is worth a look; Burma is worth a look. Like the Holy Father who gives his blessing *urbi et orbi,* we send out our prayers, our alms, our energies both to our dioceses and to the missions. Then, please God, a day will come when a future Pontiff, like Gregory of old in the trying days of the Church, will come from some monastery in Thibet; when India, which has peopled its earth and its objects with gods will see that the Spirit that fills the earth is transcendent to matter, and gives us the power of saying: "Abba, Father . . ." Then a day will come in Africa when black hands will lift up white hosts, making atonement for white hands with black souls. Finally, an hour will come when Our Lady will appear in Africa, not with a white face, but with a midnight face like the people she loves, as the whole world will come to an understanding of her mystery: *Nigra sum sed formosa.*

✠ FULTON J. SHEEN

National Director,
Pontifical Society for the Propagation of the Faith

WANTED: A CODE OF POLITICAL ETHICS

During the past year many voices have been raised to demand a return to public morality. Some are motivated by the 1952 elections but in both political parties there is agreement that nebulous standards of honesty in government must be clarified, crystallized, and incorporated into law.

Use of political influence for political gain is not something new. It seems to be a corollary of our democratic form of government. There are some new developments on the Washington scene. Perjury is commonplace. Double talk, a form of deceit, has shifted its base of operations from diplomacy to the military. Politically, the year 1951 will go down in history as the era of getting caught.

Our ethics in international diplomacy has made expediency rather than truth the basis of action. A diplomat is defined as "one who spends his nation's money to deceive other peoples" and yet it is possible that if our basic policy of preserving the integrity of our nation—social and spiritual as well as physical—were fearlessly stated at all times, we might offset the futility of the United Nations. Current investigations in Washington revolve around the question, "who lied to whom?"

Is it not time for Catholics to reaffirm the natural moral law both in the internal and external affairs of our government? The natural moral law is the ethical code which best fulfils the needs of man's nature, thus promoting maximum human welfare and maximum human perfection.

A political code, to be effective in this country, must have the support of all religious groups. One segment of Protestantism maneuvered prohibition into our national legislation. The law failed, no matter how laudable its objectives, because other religious groups did not see it as binding in conscience.

On these things, there should be general agreement in the political field.

(1) Every man has an equal obligation to support his country.

(2) Every man has an equal right to the necessities of life by honest toil.

(3) Taxation admits no double standard.

(4) The state exists for man, not man for the state.

(5) The kept contract, whether in the field of labor, price control, or international relations, is basic to civilization.

(6) A Nation, like an individual, is bound to keep good company. It is futile to cuddle atheistic communism in one land and rebuke it in another.

(7) The intrinsic spiritual dignity of man, despite the pernicious doctrine of Oliver Wendell Holmes, underlies all human associations.

(8) During elections there is no dispensation from the commandment, "Thou shalt not bear false witness."

The purpose of government is to secure justice, to preserve order, to protect rights. The Catholic attitude toward government must not parallel those who would criticize, impede, or destroy our legal processes.

As a whole, Catholics in America seem to have been more interested in Catholic political personages than in Catholic political principles. The two are not always identified. A distinguished Catholic jurist, Judge Michael J. Walsh, of the Supreme Court of New York, writes:

> Too many unqualified persons seek public office; some of them are Catholics. Too few qualified persons are willing to accept public office; too many of them are Catholics. One of the greatest liabilities which our Church and Catholic citizens must write off is the Catholic in public office who does not know the fundamental teachings of his Church and does not live up to them in his public and private life. One of the greatest assets to our Church, our country, our fellow citizens and to political parties is the Catholic in public office who knows what his Church teaches, lives up to those teachings and, by his daily life in contact with mankind, demonstrates convincingly the sublimity of his Christian Faith and the soundness and reasonableness of Christian morality. It is the practice of political parties to try to balance a ticket or political slate by selecting as candidates persons of different religious affiliations. Without passing on the merits of this practice Catholics can do a great deal to prevent the liability by insisting that the candidate who is a Catholic be representative and well equipped. This is the suggestion that the wise political leader will accept. He knows that most Catholics prefer a qualified non-Catholic to an unqualified Catholic.

Our Holy Father Pope Pius XII has time and again emphasized the obligation of citizenship, the duty of Catholics to be good citizens. He too appreciates the position of Catholics in America—

that we must work with our non-Catholic neighbors to achieve the common good. The prestige the Catholic Church enjoyed at the end of World War II was due in part to the sacrifices millions of Catholics made in time of war.

There is a slight danger that Blanshard and his backers may drive Catholics "underground" in the sense that they will hesitate to seek political office or to stand up fearlessly for a code based upon man's relationship to God. In doing that we need speak only as citizens, conscious of our national heritage.

There are many radical reform measures in the making. Some of them will bear careful scrutiny lest they interfere with our concept of freedom. Regardless of Blanshard, we must not live, as Andre Ziegfriend accused Catholics of living in 1927, in "a social citadel." Whose fault is it that there is no Catholic in the United States delegation to the United Nations, or in the policy-making branch of our State Department?

Knowledge of the natural moral law on which politics must rest, is not gained intuitively. The Catholic school and the Catholic press must be used as tools to reassert it. We should work shoulder to shoulder with non-Catholic agencies also striving for good government.

Catholics are always conscious of the Kingdom of God. The dominant note in that Kingdom is love of God and love of neighbor. In the parable of the sower, Christ points out the process of spreading the Kingdom. Good citizenship is a condition of membership in the Kingdom. And a good citizen is one who lives up to, makes, and enforces good law.

The Kefauver investigations and Senator Fulbright's impassioned plea for honesty in government should awaken Catholics to a grave peril within our nation. Just as a political revolution in 1932 changed the course of countless lives, so the present trend of events is significant indeed. We live in an hour when to be a Catholic and to be indifferent must not be synonymous. We must look to the future. If 1951 was the year of getting caught, 1952 must be the year of the articulation of a new political code which, for better or for worse, will guide the destiny of the next generation.

MAURICE S. SHEEHY

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

THE APOLOGETICS OF THE MAN BORN BLIND

It occurs in chapter nine. As this chapter is one of the best passages illustrating the Beloved Disciple's style, a few words on this style would not be out of place.

St. John was an expert literary craftsman. Since he was well known to the high priest (18:15), he probably had an education beyond the average, He has a flair for accuracy. For instance, he repeats verbally statements of Our Lord, and tells us that the meaning becomes clear only later. Instances of this are many.

To cite one. In relating Our Lord's words at the end of his promise of the Holy Eucharist, where Christ stated, "One of you is a devil," the evangelist informs us, "Now he was speaking of Judas Iscariot, the son of Simon, for he it was, though one of the Twelve, who was to betray him" (6:72). Similar instances are the explanation of the remark, "Destroy this temple" (2:19-23), and the reference to living water (7:39). Such explanations in modern works of history or biography would be placed as footnotes.

St John leaves absolutely no doubt as to the meaning of Our Lord's discourses. We may take as an example a choice of words in the famous sixth chapter. The Jews had asked, "How can this man give us his flesh to eat?" The word employed by St. John is φάγειν, the ordinary term which means to eat. Our Lord replies, "Unless you eat (φάγητε) the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood, you shall not have life in you" (6:54). But he continues, "He who eats my flesh and drinks my blood has everlasting life and I will raise him up on the last day" (6:55). In this last verse, the Beloved Disciple employs a different word, τρώγειν. This same term occurs in vv. 56, 57 and 58. According to F. Zorell this expression in its primary signification is equivalent to the German *knuspern* or the French *croquer.*[1] On this term M. J. Lagrange writes that the Evangelist uses this word, which in French would be *macher, croquer,* to forestall all possibility of a symbolic or figurative interpretation.[2] F. Prat makes the same point.[3]

[1] F. Zorell, *Lexicon Graecum Novi Testamenti,* 2nd ed. (Paris, 1931), *s.v.*

[2] M. J. Lagrange, *Évangile selon Saint Jean,* 5th ed. (Paris, 1936), p. 184.

[3] F. Prat, *Jesus-Christ,* I, 16th ed. (Paris, 1947), 393.

Exact St. John was in his terminology, and vivid in his language. He prefers short sentences. He is terse, he practices economy of words. He loves the dramatic situation, "They have no wine" (2:3); "He whom thou lovest is sick" (11:3). Dialogue fascinated him; the interview with Nicodemus (3:1-16), the beautiful story of the Samaritan Woman (4:1-43), the scene featuring Our Lord, the adulteress, the Scribes and the Pharisees (8:1-12), the resurrection of Lazarus (11:1-45). The Synoptics describe Our Lord as teaching simple Galileans, but it is as a champion against his enemies the Jews[4] that he is depicted by the Beloved Disciple.

In these pen pictures, emotion is not lacking. The son of Zebedee remembers the exact circumstances in which he had his first meeting with his Master. "It was about the tenth hour" (1:39). Or to consider a scene quite different. After Judas had received the bread dipped, "He went out quickly. Now it was night" (13:30). Night, which matched the black ingratitude of the traitor's soul.

But perhaps the most beautiful pen picture of Our Lord is at the tomb of Lazarus. "Where have you laid him? They say to him, 'Lord, come and see.' And Jesus wept" (11:34-35). Writing these lines in his extreme old age, St. John could still see the tears on the cheeks of his Master. Oh divine tears, oh blessed tears, the consolation of friendships crushed by death, dew from heaven. Even the Jews were moved. They said, "See how he loved him" (11:37).

But now we come to the dramatic passage which we have chosen for our special study. It is the gospel for the *feria quarta* of the Fourth Week of Lent (9:1-39).

And as he was passing by he saw a man blind from birth. And his disciples asked him, "Rabbi, who has sinned, this man or his parents, that he should be born blind?" Jesus answered, "Neither has this man sinned, nor his parents, but the works of God were to be made manifest in him. I must do the works of him who sent me while it is day; night is coming when no one can work. As long as I am in the world I am the light of the world." When he said these things, he spat on the ground and made clay with the spittle, and spread the clay over his eyes, and said to him, "Go, wash in the pool of Siloe (which is interpreted 'sent')." So he went away, and washed, and returned seeing. The neighbors therefore and they who were wont to see him before

[4] The meaning of this term as employed by the Evangelist will be explained later.

as a beggar, began saying, "Is not this he who used to sit and beg?" Some said, "It is he." But others said, "By no means, he only resembles him." Yet the man declared, "I am he."

They therefore said to him, "How were thy eyes opened?" He answered, "The man who is called Jesus made clay and anointed my eyes, and said to me, 'Go to the pool of Siloe and wash.' And I went and washed, and I see." And they said to him, "Where is he?" He said, "I do not know."

They took him who had been blind to the Pharisees. Now it was a Sabbath on which Jesus made the clay and opened his eyes. Again, therefore, the Pharisees asked him how he received his sight. But he said to them, "He put clay on my eyes, and I washed, and I see."

Therefore some of the Pharisees said, "This man is not from God, for he does not keep the Sabbath." But others said, "How can a man who is a sinner work these signs?" And there was a division among them. Again therefore they said to the blind man, "What dost thou say of him who opened thy eyes?" But he said, "He is a prophet."

The Jews therefore did not believe of him that he had been blind and had got his sight, until they called the parents of the one who had gained his sight, and they questioned them, saying, "Is this your son, of whom you say that he was born blind? How then does he now see?" His parents answered them and said, "We know that this is our son, and that he was born blind; but how he now sees we do not know, or who opened his eyes we ourselves do not know. Ask him; he is of age, let him speak for himeslf." These things his parents said because they feared the Jews. For already the Jews had agreed that if anyone were to confess him to be the Christ, he should be put out of the synagogue. This is why his parents said, "He is of age; question him." They therefore called a second time the man who had been blind and said to him, "Give glory to God! We ourselves know that this man is a sinner." He therefore said, "Whether he is a sinner, I do not know. One thing I do know, that whereas I was blind, now I see." They therefore said to him, "What did he do to thee? How did he open thy eyes?" He answered them, "I have told you already, and you have heard. Why should you hear again? Would you also become his disciples?" They sneered at him therefore, and said, "Thou art his disciple, but we are disciples of Moses. We know that God spoke to Moses; but as for this man, we do not know where he is from." In answer the man said to them, "Why, herein is the marvel, that you do not know where he is from, and yet he opened my eyes. Now we know that God does not hear sinners; but if anyone is a worshipper of God, and does his will, him he hears. Not from the

beginning of the world has it been heard that anyone opened the eyes of a man born blind. If this man were not from God, he could do nothing." They answered and said to him, "Thou wast altogether born in sins, and dost thou teach us?" And they turned him out.

Jesus heard that they had cast him out, and when he found him, said to him, "Dost thou believe in the Son of God?" He answered and said, "Who is he, Lord, that I may believe in him." And Jesus said to him, "Thou hast both seen him, and he it is who speaks with thee." And he said, "I believe, Lord." And falling down he worshipped him. And Jesus said, "For judgment have I come into this world, that they who do not see may see, and they who see may become blind."

Now every Catholic textbook in Apologetics has a thesis reading, "In confirmation of his doctrine (or of his divinity), Jesus Christ worked physical miracles." And in a miracle, we are told that one must establish (1) the historical truth; (2) the philosophical truth, i.e., that here we have an event which cannot be explained by natural causes or forces; (3) the theological truth, viz., that the cause is not diabolical but divine; and finally, (4) that this miracle was performed to prove the truth of a definite doctrine, or was a credential of a divine mission.

Now the man who was the center of discussion in chapter nine was originally blind. St. John makes this flat statement four times. The man himself thrice asserted it. Our Lord's disciples attest to the fact, likewise the timid parents. That the blind man later saw is equally apparent. That was the reason for all the excitement.

The cure was certainly not effected by the forces of nature. Never before or since has spittle, clay and the water from a well given vision to the sightless. Moreover, the stir caused by the cure proves that it was not considered an ordinary occurence.

So the cause must be sought outside the natural order. Was the cure of diabolical or heavenly origin? Here we are confronted with the doctrine taught by Christ and with the character or general tenor of his life.

The devil would hardly proclaim the two great commandments, and the eight beatitudes. Virginity he certainly would not extol, nor would he praise humility. Proud he was before his fall and proud he remained. When he first tempted one of our race, he promised that she would become as a god.

But we need not dwell exclusively on Our Lord's doctrine.

Practice it he did in a heroic degree. He prayed incessantly, he showed compassion, he fled from honors. To his enemies he flung this defiant challenge, "Which of you shall convict me of sin?" If none did, it was not from lack of trying.

Failing in this, and in the face of overwhelming contrary evidence, they still persisted in claiming that Our Lord worked his miracles by the power of Beelzebub. On this very occasion they said, "This man is not from God, for he does not keep the Sabbath," "We ourselves know that this man is a sinner," "As for this man, we do not know where he is from."

The *miraculé* had a simple explanation. "Now we know that God does not hear sinners; but if any one is a worshipper of God, and does his will, him he hears. Not from the beginning of the world has it been heard that anyone opened the eyes of a man born blind. If this man were not from God, he could do nothing." To this the enemies of Our Lord had only one answer, billingsgate.

On a later and even more dramatic occasion Our Lord produced his divine credentials. That was just before the resurrection of Lazarus. Next to his own triumph over death, this was his most striking miracle. Lazarus was well known and connected with the aristocracy of Jerusalem. He had been four days in the tomb. Many of the Jews were on hand, and as the Evangelist says, after the event. "Many therefore of the Jews, who had come to Mary, and had seen what he did, believed in him" (11:45).

But just before he restored Lazarus to life, to still all the cry about his dependence on Beelzebub, Our Saviour "raising his eyes, said, 'Father, I give thee thanks that thou hast heard me. Yet I know that thou always hearest me; but because of the people who stand round, I spoke, that they may believe that thou hast sent me'" (11:41-43).

To return once more to our original scene. Why did Our Lord work this particular miracle? His purpose he first states in general terms, "That the works of God were to be manifested in him [the blind man]."

But Our Divine Saviour for the benefit of the cured man and of all future ages, asked, "Dost thou believe in the Son of God? He answered and said, 'Who is he, Lord, that I may believe in him.' And Jesus said to him, 'Thou hast both seen him, and he it is that

speaks to thee.' And he said, 'I believe, Lord,' and falling down he worshipped him." And so do we.

A few more remarks on the chapter. St. John is here shown as a master of character portrayal.

The Characters

The poor timid parents present a pitiful picture, "Ask him; he is of age, let him speak for himself." Thus they refused to help their own flesh and blood. They are the prototypes of all the little people who cringe before the great and powerful, and bend before the storm of public opinion. It is over the timid bodies of such as these that dictators ride to triumph. We cannot expect that the majority of people should be heroic.

Many years ago, it was not uncommon for preachers to proclaim that persecution was a good thing for the Church. St. Paul was under no such illusion. He asked for prayers, "... that we may lead a quiet and peaceful life in all piety and good behaviour. This is good and agreeable in the sight of God our Saviour, who wishes all men to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth" (*I Tim.* 2:3-5).

But how can they come to this knowledge in countries where preaching the word of God is considered treason? Where can men find strength and solace if they are barred from reception of the sacraments? Martyrs there were in the early Church, but there were also *libellatici* and *traditores*.[5]

The enemies of Our Lord: St. John calls them "some of the Pharisees" and "the Jews." Now the term "Jews" St. John frequently employs to designate the leaders who were opposed to Our Lord. To him the word connoted the priests, members of the Sanhedrin, the leaders of the people and the Pharisaic factions generally.[6]

It was Caiphas who gave counsel to the Jews that it was expedient that one man should die for his people (18:14). It was the chief priests who delivered Christ to Pilate (18:35). The chief

[5] On these cf. B. J. Kidd, *A History of the Church to A.D. 461*, I (Oxford, 1922), 432 f., 516, 535, 538.

[6] Zorell, *Lexicon . . . , s.v.;* and M. J. Lagrange, *Évangile selon Saint Jean*, pp. cxx f.

priests, when they beheld Our Lord after the scourging, cried out, "Crucify him" (19:6, 15). The people chosen by God, the Evangelist designates as Israel (1:31, 49; 3:10; 12:13). Our Divine Lord in praising Nathaniel said, "Behold a true Israelite in whom there is no guile" (1:47).[7]

One of the most terrifying pictures of the enemies of Christ is found in chapter eleven. Lazarus has just been raised from the dead. "The chief priests and Pharisees therefore gathered together a Council and said, 'What are we doing? For *this man is working* many signs. If we let him alone as he is, *all will believe in him*, and the Romans will come and take away both our place and our nation'" (45-45).

A clear case of deliberately sinning against the light. Well does St. Ignatius in his meditation on the Two Standards say that the devil tempts to honors and riches, and finally to pride.

Ah, but the blind man! Heroic is his stature, boundless his courage. He flecked the whip of sarcasm into the raw flesh of the haughty Pharisees. Never did he leave the *status quaestionis* in doubt. "One thing I know, that whereas I was blind, now I see." And he could prove the *veritas philosophica*. "Now we know that God does not hear sinners; but if any one is a worshipper of God, and does his will, him he hears. Not from the beginning of the world has it been known that anyone opened the eyes of a man born blind."

But his devastating *coup-de-grace* is "Would you also become his disciples?" St. John, who was standing by, must have thrilled as this expert turned his sword in the black hearts of the chief priests and Pharisees.

JOHN W. MORAN, S.J.

Weston College
Weston, Mass.

[7] St. Peter began his first sermon with the words, "men of Israel" (*Acts* 2: 22). He used the same term in his speech to the ruling elders, scribes, Annas and Caiphas (*Acts* 4: 10). This was a title of honor, for the angel, and therefore God, changed the name of Jacob to Israel (*Gen.* 32: 28). St. Paul employs the designation "Israel according to the flesh," (*I Cor.* 10: 18). That means the Jews who rejected Christ. (Cf. A. Fernandez in *Verbum Domini*, XI [1934], 299.) The Catholic Church, the Apostle calls the "Israel of God" (*Gal.* 6: 16).

OUR LADY AND OUR TIMES

Comparing the Middle Ages with modern times, the theologian may be tempted to forget that the present is actually always the best time for us, and so to prefer the age of the cathedrals and the theological *Summas* of St. Thomas, St. Bonaventure and St. Albert to our age of the skyscraper and the encyclopaedia. He is, however, easily preserved from this temptation by Marian theology, with its recent developments. The Middle Ages were undoubtedly the golden age of speculative theology, and the science of theology has perhaps never been dealt with, in accordance with its own method, with as much mastery and balance as then. But the first treasure the theologian has at his disposal is the Church's body of tradition and while such and such aspects of this may undergo occasional eclipses—i.e. apparent diminutions—in reality it is continuously being enriched by new explicitations of the Faith.

Mariology is undoubtedly that part of theology which has progressed most since the time of St. Thomas and St. Bonaventure; and not only progressed but progressed the most supernaturally and peacefully. Heresies and errors have had little or nothing to do with bringing these developments about, as has been in part the case with the theology of the sacraments and of the Church. The enrichments of Marian theology have come, so to speak, from a different source, at once purer and more "intimate"; it has been the author of the inner life of our souls, the divine inspiring force of the contemplative life of the Church—the Holy Ghost, who has been almost the sole cause of this progress. And the Church, through its solemn magisterium, has confirmed these developments with the definitions of the two great dogmas of the Immaculate Conception and the Assumption.

When Our Lord, in his Gospel, announced His resurrection to His apostles, He could likewise have announced His Mother's Assumption. But it was in the designs of Providence that He should overcome, as it were, His desire to do so and keep all the splendors of Mary's motherhood hidden—all those splendors contained in germ in the Immaculate Conception—which were opened up with her glorious Assumption. Out of a sort of divine humility

towards His Church. He allowed these truths to remain hidden during the early times of Christianity and left it to Peter's successors to explicitate them solemnly when the proper time should come. When He gave Peter, and Peter's successors, the power to bind and to unbind, Jesus, looking down the centuries, saw—and saw with particular affection—the two Popes who were to make use of their personal powers, independently of any Council, to glorify His Mother.

If, then Jesus waited until our time before solemnly manifesting the splendors of Mary's motherhood, was it not out of mercy for us? He waited, indeed, until the world had attained this age of fullness and of misery in order to give us these two definitions which are the two great treasures of our era.

The Marian theologian is thence led, both by his love for the Blessed Virgin and by the demands of his science, to inquire how these two dogmas, and, more generally still, Marian theology, offer the remedies which are the most supernaturally adapted to our time.

We shall consider (1) how it is that the Blessed Virgin is our hope; then (2) how Marian theology answers the just aspirations of the theologian of today; and (3) how this theology offers people of today a spirituality well adapted to our time, both on account of its simplicity and on account of its nobility.

THE BLESSED VIRGIN IS OUR HOPE

The Blessed Virgin is our hope, because she prevents our optimism from being too human, and because she preserves us from despair. She supernaturalizes our hope in its incentive and in its object.

As far as its incentive is concerned, Mary teaches us not to rely on the power of man but on the all-powerful mercy of God. The Immaculate Conception and the Assumption are triumphs of grace.

For, by comparison with her predestination, what did Our Lady possess by nature? The human race is the last of the intellectual substances. By birth, Mary belonged to a race of sinners. She also belonged to the weaker sex. In antiquity—and, as a matter of fact, in certain present-day civilizations as well—women were looked down upon because of all the various handicaps inherent in motherhood. Woman was considered incapable of reaching by herself the

finalities proper to human nature. Man alone, with the vigor of his intelligence and the independence made possible for him by his physical and psychological constitution, was thought to be capable of living the life of the mind and serving the common good in public functions. He alone was supposed to be properly armed to achieve the great finalities of the two kinds of human life, the contemplative life and the active life. The woman's role was merely to bear his children and look after his household. The best of the ancient philosophers doubtless had some idea of the possibility of man and woman sharing a type of life in which the woman should not be man's slave but his servant—and a servant who should be his companion and his friend at the same time. By herself, nevertheless, she could not achieve the true ends of human life. It was through man that she found her finality.

The Assumption, then, is the triumph of grace in Mary. It is likewise the glorification of her motherhood. God looked upon His servant's humility, and, by His grace, exalted her above all the angels and above all mankind. For what He asked her for was the service of her motherhood, and a very humble service it was as regards what Mary herself brought to it. She was deprived, in accordance with God's designs, of that spiritual consolation which is usually part of motherhood, the child's early education. For Our Lady, strictly speaking, did not educate the heart and soul of Jesus. St. Thomas tells us quite clearly that Jesus could have no master here below, and it was Mary, rather, who was the disciple of the spirit and heart of Jesus.

But her motherhood, her all-humble motherhood, was adorned in every possible way through God's good pleasure. At the outset, and before there was any merit on her part, God willed that, as from the beginning of her spiritual life, the Blessed Virgin should be placed, by fullness of grace, apart from the world of sin and above the angels and above the saints. The ultimate preparation of the Saviour's coming, something entirely spiritual and entirely intimate and personal, was her task. She it was who was to receive Him, and to receive Him as a queen receives, in behalf of all of us. She alone was given His spirit before His birth. He shared with her the first thirty years of His life in a unique intimacy. During His years of preaching, she was the only listener to grasp what He said completely, because she was the only one who pos-

sessed His spirit to the full; she was the only disciple really worthy of Him. At the Cross, she alone, in the mystery of the Compassion, had a part in the objective redemption of others.

The Assumption, then, is the glorification of Our Lady's motherhood, but it is also the glorification of her suffering.

The reason for the discouragement and despair of a very great number of people today, and often the occasion of their complete estrangement from God, is the Cross. Seen in the light of the Blessed Virgin, however, the Cross becomes a reason to hope, and the most intimate bond uniting us to Christ. For the ultimate significance of Mary's motherhood lies precisely in the Saviour's Cross. It was His Father who gave Him all the perfections of His intelligence; the Father who anointed Him with His sacerdotal unction. But it was Mary who gave Him a body enabling Him to suffer and die; and this is the reason for His gratitude towards her and for His peculiar love for her. She gave Him the body and the blood which were to constitute the material substances for His sacrifice. And, furthermore, the perfections that adorn Mary's motherhood by grace are all the fruit of Christ's blood. She is the eldest daughter of His Passion.

Our Lady thus supernaturalizes our hope in its incentive, but she also supernaturalizes it in its object. She prevents us from stopping short with worldly happiness, and obliges us to raise our eyes to Heaven, where she discloses to us the glorification of matter.

With Aristotle, the order of the material world was considered to be entirely for the generation of living beings, and thence for man. Modern philosophy has but confirmed this very profound view. With the disciple of St. Thomas, the doctrine is extended to affirm that all human generation—all the different generations—were for the generation of the Son of Mary. Mary's motherhood and Jesus' Cross, having, in accordance with the designs of God, been intimately bound together, are the two masterpieces drawn from our human nature by the Holy Ghost, masterpieces which, above time and space, dominate the whole world of matter. In Heaven there is, of course, no Cross; but Jesus, still bearing the stigmata of His Passion, is intimately united, in His soul and the body of His resurrection, with His glorified Mother.

It was in the sorrowful embrace of their hearts, constituting the

mystery of the Compassoin, that Jesus and Mary merited on Calvary. It is in the same embrace of love, accomplished no longer in suffering and death but in the glory and exultation of their entire beings—bodies and souls—that, from Heaven, they apply the merits of Calvary, direct the universe, and cause all things to contribute to the good of the predestined.

There is, however, something more still to be said about this doctrine. By their bodies, Jesus and Mary continue to be part of our world. A part—and the principal part, as we have already pointed out—of our corporeal universe has, then, already been glorified. And this is the pledge of our hope.

In face of the growing threats of the prophets of Satan, the Christian must therefore not allow himself to give in to anxiety. He must maintain his confidence not only in the salvation of souls, but also in the salvation of the terrestrial universe, because the principal part of the universe has already been placed out of reach, and because it contains the principle of the glorification of the whole.

The proclamation of the dogma of the Assumption does not, of course, necessarily mark the beginning of an era of prosperity and peace in the world. Our Lady's promise of peace to her children here below pertains to inner peace. For the Queen of Peace is also the Queen of Martyrs, and since it was through the Cross that everything came to her, she knows the worth of it too well to wish her children to be exempted from it. Through the glorification of her Assumption, Mary fortifies our hope so that we may have the courage to hasten the second coming of Christ with our prayers, as St. Peter enjoins us to do in his second Epistle (3:12). Jesus and Mary entered into their glory only after, and through, the Cross; likewise, our world can partake in the glorification of its King and Queen only after having passed through the agony of the last days.

TODAY'S ASPIRATIONS AND MARIAN THEOLOGY

Marian theology provides people today with the addition to theology which corresponds to—and at the same time rectifies—the new aspirations of our time. Viewed from the standpoint of theology, these aspirations can be reduced to two: the meaning of history and the sense of spirituality.

Marian theology, like all true theology, obliges us, to begin with, to place ourselves on the plane of eternity. The two dogmas of the Immaculate Conception and the Assumption put us on this level by making us consider Our Lady's motherhood in the light of her predestination. Taken in this perspective, however, Mary's motherhood gives us the meaning of history, and history, if considered, with humility, in the light of this motherhood, is seen to take its proper place in revelation.

Thanks to the Blessed Virgin, Jesus is the Son of Man. If God had created the new Adam as an adult, He would, of course, still have been the Son of God, but He would not have been the Son of Man, properly speaking. It is through Mary that Jesus is our brother; that He belongs to our race; that He takes His place in the lineage of the generations; that His earthly life began with birth and went through the normal stages of our lives and the lives of our neighbors.

Again, in His soul, Jesus was already *comprehensor*. The facts of His earthly life, of course, formed part of history as far as their outwardness was concerned, but, in their inner substance, they did not belong to time. Doubtless, it would be incorrect to say simply, without explanation, that the measure of His inner life was eternity as constantly participated by Him. There were different forms of duration in His life which must be distinguished. The Beatific Vision was measured by eternity as participated; the infused sciences, by the *aevum*, and the acquired knowledge, by time. His activities were none the less all those of one and the same concrete subject acting and knowing; and the "existing," with this subject, was measured by eternity as participated. Jesus' humanity subsisted in the Word. The Thomists say, therefore, that in Christ there was only one single act of existence. The Saviour's humanity subsisted, and existed, in and through the Word. All the events of His life were therefore measured by eternity as participated, in that they were rooted in the existing subject. These facts, or events, are mysteries: through the concrete subject in whom they existed, there was truly something eternal in them. On the other hand, Jesus wished Mary to be the intimate witness of all the events of His life, and Mary was but a creature, living merely in faith. Her entire life—her inner life as well as her outer life—was therefore measured by time, like ours.

Let us try now to enlarge our perspective and discern the deeper meaning of the history of the world in the light of the Blessed Virgin. It was God's will that the whole history of salvation should be recapitulated, as it were, in Mary, or rather in her personal history. To comprehend the economy of the Incarnation as it was actually decreed by Divine Wisdom, one must realize that it began with the Immaculate Conception and was given its ultimate termination only with the Assumption, when Our Lady's body, from which the body of Jesus had been formed, was again at His side in glory.

Before the coming of the Saviour, then, Mary was given His spirit. The entire preparation of the Old Testament was to terminate in her and through her. She is, indeed, the Queen of the Prophets. The economy of her faith was such that the earlier years of her life belonged to the Old Testament, though in her love and the gifts of the spirit, she already belonged to the New. This stretch, so to speak, between the explicitations of her faith and the intimacy of her charity explains the ardor of her hope and the inward rhythm of her life.

Besides answering our aspirations as to the meaning of history, Marian theology provides the people of this twentieth century with the addition to spiritual theology for which they are asking.

It most assuredly possesses all the objectivity and strict-thinking of speculative theology. It likewise has all the practical bearing, and the applicability to particular cases, of moral theology. Its special characteristics are, however, its spiritual value and its mystical savour.

Our Lady herself acted under the motion of the Holy Ghost in everything she did. She was continually under the rule of the gifts, and more especially the gift of Wisdom. She was nevertheless still on the plane of faith, and her docility towards the Holy Ghost therefore required her to have an attitude of confidence and abandon.

Again, Marian theology, on account of its very object, has developed, and is developing, with a continuously expanding force. The Holy Ghost adorned Mary's soul with all its perfections, one after another; it caused her to grow in her life of intimacy with God; it led her by paths which were always new—those of the Joyful Mysteries, those of the Sorrowful Mysteries, those of the

Glorious Mysteries. The initial grace of the Immaculate Conception, compared with that of the other saints, was an immense universe; compared with the consummate grace of the Assumption, it was the smallest grain of mustard seed.

An advantage which the spirituality of the saints has over theology is that it makes the principles involved concrete in experiences and facts which constitute examples for our use. Inevitably, however, by thus humanizing these principles, it dims their *éclat* somewhat, and likewise reduces their force. Even the highest types of spirituality suffer in this way. The most genuine graces take on a certain special coloring—that of our mental processes—immediately they are received in human beings, and become somewhat limited in consequence. And this is why spirituality should always be judged by theology, as theology disengages it, so to speak, from its necessarily particularized human elements.

The only spirituality which has no deficiencies, the only spirituality the purity of which remains absolutely intact, is that of Our Lady. The spirituality of the saints is various and varied; that of the Blessed Virgin is one and single—precisely because it is the only one to remain at the level of theology. Here, there are no limitations to the working of the principles, and the theologian thus has before him a life of a mere creature lived in complete accord with these principles. Marian theology is thence the only spiritual theology which, while dealing with the life of the soul, its experiences and its progress, remains, by its object, entirely on the level of dogma, thus fully deserving the name of theology.

THE BLESSED VIRGIN OFFERS THE KIND OF SPIRITUALITY WHICH IS MOST DIVINELY ADAPTED TO OUR TIME

Our Lady offers people of the twentieth century the model of the at once simple and concentrated spirituality which is necessary for their inner life, and also for their apostolate. Taken as a model, spirituality always has two objects. The first is to teach souls to pray—and, above all, to pray in the manner which puts them in intimate touch with God—and to show them how to spiritualize their whole life, putting into it the spirit of Jesus and keeping it more and more immediately, more and more completely, under the radiance of this union in prayer and in the attitude of mind resulting from this heart-to-heart contact with God. The

second object is to keep the whole of one's moral life closely under the influence of the two poles of the inner life—humility and charity, which can deploy all their possibilities, and become intimately united, only in prayer of the most divine character.

In face of the false mystical faiths and of all the natural mystical faiths founded on human reason, the figure of Mary brings out what is essential and unique in supernatural mysticism. Her inner life took place entirely on the level of prayer—prayer, again, of the purest kind, all intimacy with God, and humility, and charity. These two great virtues, which distinguish Christian spirituality from all other kinds of spirituality, are the deeper explanation of the spirituality of the Immaculate Heart.

Mary's heart was a humble heart and a loving heart. Everything in her had become permeated with these virtues. Original sin was a sin of pride and there is always some connection with, or some part of, pride in all sin. Mary, being the Immaculate, was the humblest of all God's creatures, and her humility was the purest of all humility; not even mixed with penitence, as with Mary Magdalene. It was the humility of the "unprofitable servant," wide open to God's action in her soul. More precisely still, it was utter self-effacement with no turning-back towards self, but looking, rather, only in one direction, where there was everything that counted for her—the Beloved. Mary was also the poorest of the saints, for she possessed none of those unhappy riches of ours—our sins and errors; and never did she take possession of a grace for her own sake. Her single treasure was her faithfulness—her faithfulness to Love, which kept her always alert and awake.

In the midst of this world so agitated by wars and revolutions, so torn in every direction, so tempted by materialism in all its different forms, God, in His mercy, seems to be taking a sort of divine revenge by granting, and being ready to grant, the graces of His intimacy with a new kind of lavishness. He seems to wish to give Himself to all, whatever the circumstances of people's lives. His divine wisdom, in fact, seems to be making sport of these very exterior difficulties, trying to show us, more clearly than ever, that the graces of contemplation are a gift of His with no connection with any outer circumstance. In short, to those who are in the thick of action—from the heads of government to the workers in the factories—as well as to those who are behind the doors of

the cloister, God seems to wish to reveal the secret of His intimacy.

And, for the carrying-out of this divine plan, He asks us to go to school to Mary, to the school of her Immaculate Heart. By having us share in her all-intimate, all-humble, all-loving prayer, the Blessed Virgin will teach us how to find spiritual childhood again, how to become the "little children" Christ wants us to be.

Marian spirituality—of which, incidentally, St. Louis Grignon de Montfort appears to be one of the most authentic heralds—is at once the simplest and the highest form of spirituality. It is the highest in that prayer—the kind of prayer we have tried to describe above—is here rid of all extraneous elements and presented in its pure essentials. Is it not, indeed, the heart-to-heart and lasting contact with Jesus Himself? And does not Our Lady unjealously communicate to the children of her love the very secrets of her prayer? Marian spirituality is also the simplest form of spirituality, because it is adaptable to any kind of situation and goes with all manner of works. It is not for any kind of temperament in particular, but for all; not for any particular kind of life, but for all. Anyone who has enough humility and enough love to go to school to Mary, to remain within her mother's heart, to mingle his prayers with hers, can receive this spirituality from her.

Here on this level, the distinction between the contemplative life and the life of action seems almost to disappear. When Our Lady takes us into her heart we are drawn back to the source of these two kinds of life itself. She teaches us the secret of the admirable unity of her own existence. For she was at one and the same time the Servant and the Bride. The entire mystery of her inner life was contained in these two aspects—the humility and self-effacement of the Servant and the magnanimity and ardor of the Bride; and it is this fundamental attitude which we find in all the mysteries of her life—the Joyful and the Sorrowful and the Glorious Mysteries—and which we observe maintaining a deep and intimate unity behind and below the most varied appearances.

She teaches her pupils to show themselves in everything to be both servants and "friends," as Jesus said. She teaches them how to behave as friends and how to remain in the presence of Jesus, and thus within themselves, in the midst of the most exterior and the most absorbing occupations of the active life. On the highest summits of the contemplative life, she reminds them that they still

remain "unprofitable servants"; that they must use the graces of intimacy they receive as if not possessing them; that they must receive them, not for themselves, but for the Lord, for Mary herself and for other souls. In true holy prayer like this, the Blessed Virgin thus teaches her children humility and love, and, in and through humility and love, she teaches them the whole spirit of the Gospel.

The spirituality of Our Lady is, then, the highest and the simplest form of spirituality, but it is likewise the most divine and the most human; and, in this, again, it answers the need of our time. It is the most divine, not only because, here, everything is viewed in the light of prayer—and, once again, the purest kind of prayer—but because it enables us to reach Jesus from within and to discover the secrets of His heart. It thus prevents us from stopping with the Jesus of history and the works He did during His life on earth. And it leads us directly, through Jesus' heart, to the Blessed Trinity. Taking us thus into the intimacy of her earthly life with Jesus, Mary reveals to us the Son's intimacy with the Father.

Her spirituality is the most human of spiritualities, because it assumes all the great things of human life—those of the family and those of the community. Being the most unified and the most universal spirituality, it contains, and eminently so, all the others.

At a time like ours when efficiency of action demands constantly greater specialization, whether in Christian countries or missionary countries, unity on the spiritual plane is a most urgently important matter. Marian spirituality answers this need perfectly.

It is adapted to the poor and, in general, to all those whose place in society is that of service or labor or the mere carrying-out of orders. Our Lady was poor. The Holy Family was a poor family; poor sometimes to the point of poverty. And, too, all her life, Mary took second place. She therefore knows what want and obscurity mean.

Her spirituality is, of course, adapted to women, but especially so at this time when women are taking a place in the community which they have never had before and when, still more generally, the problems of sex are being proposed anew. The Blessed Virgin shows us woman's real greatness from God's point of view.

Marian spirituality is adapted both to the layman and to the religious. The house in Nazareth was both the abode of the first Christian family and the first monastery. For while Joseph and Mary took the vow of virginity at the same time that they made their marriage vows, their marriage was none the less a true marriage.

Marian spirituality, again, is adapted to the active life as well as the contemplative. It is intended in a very special way for missionaries, because they have need of a spirituality which is both deeply divine and deeply human. The pagan in the modern world is no longer a primitive and he is more and more likely to become an atheist with an anti-Christian philosophy and anti-Christian rules of life. The contemplative alone can place him, as it were, face-to-face with the invisible by the testimony of his life, and oblige him to put to himself the question of God by the very fact of his own existence.

It was God's will that Our Lady should be the prototype of the Church; what was accomplished first in her so eminently is what the Church brings about multifariously among the faithful. It is, hence, in the divine logic, impossible to come to the Church without first accepting the Blessed Virgin, just as it is impossible to accept Christ and deny the Trinity.

And—another very important point—the mystery of the Church takes on, in the light of Mary, a new sweetness and a new fullness. If those who question the necessity of the Church's existence, and have so much difficulty in discerning the Church for the mystery it is, could but bring themselves to raise their eyes to Mary, the mystery of the Church as our Mother—a motherhood full of strength and gentleness—would appear to them clearly in the light of Our Lady.

THOMAS PHILIPPE, O.P.

Le Saulchoir

INTERROGATION OF THE WOMAN PARTY IN THE *SUPER RATO* PROCESS

Under date of June 12, 1942, the Supreme Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office issued a Decree concerning the necessity of employing certain precautions in the conduct of matrimonial causes of impotence and of non-consummation,[1] in the interests of safeguarding and maintaining the proper sense of Christian modesty and decency. Hereafter this document will be referred to as the Decree of 1942. This Decree introduces certain changes in the Rules originally issued by the Sacred Congregation of the Sacraments under date of May 7, 1923,[2] which regulate the construction of the process in causes of ratified and non-consummated marriage.[3] This process will hereafter be designated as the process *Super rato*. Among these changes is the requirement of the Decree of 1942, paragraph 6, that the particular interrogations of the woman shall be conducted before the tribunal, but by the agency, or instrumentality, of a qualified physician selected by the Bishop.[4] As is apparent from the text of this provision, the hearing of the woman (*excussio mulieris*) is that oral examination which is executed in the due course of the

[1] Suprema Sacra Congregatio S. Officii, Decretum, *De quibusdam cautelis adhibendis in causis matrimonialibus impotentiae et inconsummationis, Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, XXXIV (1942), 200-202 (hereafter cited: *AAS*). The text of this document in the original Latin may be found in *The Jurist*, II (1942), 395, in the October number. The English text is in Bouscaren, *The Canon Law Digest* (Milwaukee, 1943), II, 549-551. It is difficult for the writer to understand why the hearing of the woman, party in the cause, is there (p. 551) designated as cross-examination. The examination referred to is the *direct* examination, which will, of course, include any necessary cross-examination.

[2] *AAS*, XV (1923), 389-413. English translation in Bouscaren, *The Canon Law Digest* (Milwaukee, 1934), I, 764.

[3] S. Congregatio de Disciplina Sacramentorum, *Regulae servandae in processibus super matrimonio rato et non consummato* (editio altera aucta. Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 1934). This document will be designated hereafter as *Regulae servandae;* the individual Rules will be cited by the term, Reg., and the number of the respective Rule.

[4] "Excussio mulieris, quae est pars in causa, paratis ad normam iuris interrogationibus eidem proponendis, semper quidem fiat coram Tribunali, *sed a medico*, qui sit religione, moribus, aetate gravis, ab ipso Ordinario deligendus, omni exceptione maior."

process *Super rato,* referred to in Reg. 50, sqq., concerning the deposition of the parties in the cause, as one of the means of ascertaining the truth of the facts alleged in the cause, and which is known as the sworn confession of the spouses (*iurata confessio coniugum*).[5] This article will deal with two items of paragraph 6 of the Decree of 1942; namely, in Part I, the deposition of the woman in the presence of the judge (*coram Tribunali*), and in Part II, the particular interrogations conducted by the physician.

Part I: Deposition Before the Tribunal

The Decree of 1942 states in paragraph 6 that the oral examination (or deposition) of the woman, who is a party in the cause, shall always take place before the tribunal, but through the instrumentality of a physician.[6] The words *coram Tribunali* indicate that the oral examination must take place before the court, that is, that the court must be in session; the judge must be officially present.

Tribunal means judge, the active principle of judicial jurisdiction and administration. This term recalls the description of the ecclesiastical trial, found in canon 1552, §1. There it is stated that the term ecclesiastical trial signifies the lawful discussion and definition before an ecclesiastical tribunal (*coram tribunali ecclesiastico*) of a controversy of which the Church has the right to take cognizance. Noval correctly and consistently renders the term *tribunal* with *iudex* (judge) as synonymous with the former.[7]

[5] Reg. 20; cf. Hickey, "Requirements of the Ratum et Non Consummatum Process," *The Jurist,* V (1945), 12-13, under the title: *Jurata Confessio Coniugum.*

[6] "6. Excussio mulieris, quae est pars in causa . . . semper quidem fiat coram Tribunali, *sed a medico . . .* "

[7] *Commentarium codicis iuris canonici,* Liber IV, *De processibus,* Pars I, *De Iudiciis* (Hereafter cited: *Commentarium*), where he explains the elements of the judicial trial, n. 16: "Quatuor distinguuntur elementa constitutiva essentialia . . . pro cognitione iudicii forensis . . . videlicet: . . . 3) *subiectum activum,* seu *iudex* vel *tribunal;* . . . "; where he describes the judge, n. 22: "3) *Subiectum activum.* Est *iudex* vel *tribunal.* Iudex vero est persona . . ."; where he explains the character of the trial as *ecclesiastical,* n. 37: ". . . nam quod iudicium sit *ecclesiasticum,* vel secus, non dependet ab obiecto, sed a subiecto activo, seu *tribunali;* . . . [tribunali] ecclesiastico: nimirum a) quod sit deputatum ab Ecclesia, et b) iudicet eius nomine. Quapropter non est tribunal ecclesiasticum si aut iudex sit quidem clericus sed iudicet nomine et vice potestatis saecularis . . ."; where he explains the connotation of the word *forum,* n. 56: "Forum . . . in re autem iudiciaria

Tribunal as connoting judge, in the sense of one vested with and presently administering judicial jurisdiction, has entered the Code of Canon Law from the jurisprudence in decretal legislation. Canon 1636 states that the residental Bishop has the right of establishing his tribunal in any place in his diocese which is not exempt. The meaning of this provision is not satisfied with merely the connotation that the Bishop may erect a physical tribunal anywhere. This law signifies by the term *tribunal* precisely and primarily that the Bishop has the right of holding court; that is, of exercising and administering judicial jurisdiction, acting as judge. The decretal *Cum episcopus* in the *Liber sextus,* which describes the Bishop sitting as judge, and from which the present law of the Code is taken,[8] demands this interpretation.[9] For it was the evident intent of the decretal *Cum episcopus,* as it is the consequent intent of canon 1636, to express not the mere authorization of erecting a physical tribunal, but moreover the right of administering judicial authority as contained in, and as a necessary deduction from, the more extensive right of episcopal jurisdiction.[10] The same connotation of *tribunal,* as signifying the judge as an active principle administering judicial jurisdiction, is disclosed in canon 1573, §2,[11] and in canon 1877.[12] Manifestly, the place of the tribunal as merely

---

sumitur: ". . . b) pro *tribunali* vel *iudice* qui exercet potestatem iudicialem . . ."

[8] Cf. Wernz-Vidal, *Ius canonicum,* Tomus VI, *De processibus,* (Romae, 1927), nn. 191, 193 (Hereafter cited: *Ius can.,* VI.). See also Gasparri's footnote to this canon.

[9] Cf. Can. 6, 2°; c. 7, *de officio ordinarii,* I, 16, in VI°: "Cum Episcopus in tota sua dioecesi iurisdictionem ordinariam noscatur habere: Dubium non existit, quin in quolibet loco ipsius dioecesis non exempto, per se vel per alium possit pro tribunali sedere: causas ad Ecclesiasticum forum spectantes audire: personas Ecclesiasticas (cum earum excessus exegerint) capere, ac carceri deputare: necnon et caetera, quae ad ipsius spectant officium libere exercere." Cf. to the same effect the glosses to this law ad v. *Non exempto,* and ad v. *Libere.*

[10] Thus Passerinus (d.1677) says: "n. 1. In hac Decretali Pontifex non condit ius novum simpliciter, sed ex eo, quod in lege est certum, aliud per evidentem, et indubitatam consequentiam deducit, et observandum decernit." *Commentaria in primum librum sexti decretalium* (Venetiis, 1698), Lib. I, *de officio ordinarii,* Cap. VII (Hereafter cited: *Commentaria*).

[11] "Officialis unum constituit tribunal cum Episcopo loci: . . . "

[12] There it is provided as one of the modes of uttering the judicial sentence, that it may be published in solemn fashion by the judge in session

a physical locale, wherever that may be, has itself no inherent judicial power and function necessary for the administration of justice. The physical place itself with all its appurtenances means juridically nothing without the presence of one vested with judicial authority; so that without such jurisdiction there is no *tribunal*. To state the matter briefly, in order to have a tribunal, it is essential that there be present a bearer of judical authority; failing this there is only a physical place and no judicial procedure whatever.

The absolute necessity of the presence of a bearer of judicial jurisdiction in order to have a *tribunal* is revealed by the commentary of decretalists on the term *forus* or *forum*.[13] This juridic term signifies much more than a place or a territory, which itself is only an aggregate of fields; though it does, indeed, contain the element of locality. *Forus* in law necessarily embraces the element of judicial power; *forus* is a juridic notion consisting of a certain place and of the exercise of judical jurisdiction there.[14] While the element of place is a necessary ingredient, the active element of one exercising judicial authority is to be emphasized in this concept.[15] And while

---

of court (*sollemniter factam a iudice pro tribunali sedente*); certainly the words of this law point to the judge as officially administering judicial jurisdiction. See also the context in this canon: " . . . penes cancellariam tribunalis . . ."

[13] Cf. c. 10, X, *de verborum significatione*, V, 40.

[14] Barbosa (d.1649), *Collectanea doctorum tam veterum quam recentiorum in ius pontificium universum*, Tomus Primus, (Lugduni, 1656), Lib. II, *De foro competenti*, Tit. II, in princ., n. 5: ". . . recurrendo ad partes ex quibus forus componitur, constat enim forus ex causa, lege, et iudicio, d. c. forus in princ. vers. constat autem. Unde a territorio longe differt, quippe cum absque eo quod detur causa et iudicium, importet solum universitatem agrorum, intra fines cuiusque civitatis d. § territorium [D. (50, 16) 239] . . . adhuc tamen forus non erit, quia ultra fines proprii territorii qui necessario antecedere debent, ut ius dici possit . . . forus ulterius progreditur et requirit causam, legem, et iudicium, d. cap. forus, vers. constat . . . itaque forus exterior non ex solo loco exercendarum litium, neque ex sola iurisdictione, seu iudicio, sed ex utroque et caeteris, de quibus in d. cap. forus l. componitur: unde iam colligitur forum non solum dici et comprehendere iurisdictionem, quae exercetur, in litibus dirimendis, sed etiam locum exercendarum litium tamquam aggregatum et compositum ex utrisque . . ."

[15] Thus, Bouix (d.1870), *Tractatus de iudiciis ecclesiasticis*, Parisiis, 1855), p. 243: "1°. Quid nomine fori intelligendum veniat. . . . Usurpabatur insuper. . . . Item pro territorio intra cuius fines ius a magistratu dicitur, dirimuntur lites, puniuntur rei. Nos vero per *Forum* aliud non intelligimus, quam ipsammet legitimam auctoritatem, ad quam citatae partes venire tenen-

forus or *forum* is interpreted to connote tribunal in the sense of place of judicial litigation, the note of performance of judicial jurisdiction lies therein as a characteristically essential feature.[16]

Thus the juridic phrase *"pro tribunali sedere"* signifies the exercise of judicial jurisdiction by the judge[17] in the language of both canonists[18] and civilists.[19] In fact, the sources in respect to the latter

---

tur, ut, proposita actione, auditisque actore et reo, ab eadem auctoritate pronuntietur absolutionis vel condemnationis sententia."—quoting with approval Bianchi (d.1768).

[16] Bouix, *loc. cit.*: "Forus seu Forum, ait Pirhing . . . in proposito significat, inprimis locum in quo lites et iudicia exercentur, seu ubi quis convenire potest; capite *Forus* (10, extra *de verborum significatione*); ubi dicitur: *Forus est exercendarum litium locus.* Et hoc forum alias etiam tribunal, vel auditorium, vel etiam, respectu Papae aut iudicis ecclesiastici, consistorium vocatur. . . . Adeoque *forum* dicit et importat, tum iurisdictionem quae exercetur in litibus dirimendis, tum etiam locum seu tribunal in quo lites dirimuntur; ita ut forum sit aliquid aggregatum et compositum ex utrisque."—quoting with approval Pirhing (d.1679), *Ius canonicum*, (Dilingae, 1674), I, Lib. II, tit. II, Sect. I, §I. To the same practical effect Bouix, *loc. cit.*, also quotes Huth (d.1771) [*Ius canonicum ad libros V decretalium Gregorii IX explicatum* (Venetiis, 1843)], Lib. II, tit. II, *de foro competenti.*

[17] Cf. Lega (d.1935), *Praelectiones de iudiciis ecclesiasticis* (Romae, 1896), Lib. I, Vol. I, n. 365.

[18] Cf. Wernz (d.1914), *Ius decretalium, De iudiciis ecclesiasticis* (Prati, 1914), V, n. 314: "Ecclesia catholica quoad locum actuum iudicialium eadem fere adoptavit principia atque ius Iustinianeum." (Hereafter cited: *Ius Decret.*, V.) Wernz-Vidal, *Ius can.*, VI, n. 191.

[19] Calvinus, *Magnum lexicon iuridicum* (Coloniae Allobrogum, 1759), Tomus Secundus, s. v. *Tribunal:* "Tribunal, ut Isid. definit, locus sublimis et editus in quo considentes magistratus ius dicunt. l. pen. ff. de iustit. et iur. [D. (1, 1) 11]. Pro Tribunali enim soli magistratus sedebant. Unde ius dicentem hac periphrasi nonnunquam Iureconsulti demonstrant, Qui tribunali praeest, qui pro tribunali cognoscit, l. § penul. ff. de iudic. [D. (5, 1) 1]. l. 2. ff. de re iudic. [D. (42, 1) 2]. Briss." Prateius, *Lexicon iuris civilis et canonici* (Francof. ad Moen., 1581), s. v. *Tribunal* furnishes the same information. Cf. gloss ad v. *Qui tribunali*, D. (5, 1) 1, where the tribunal is employed also in connection with the exercise of administrative authority and of *imperium.* Cf. also D. (38, 15) 2, 1 and 2 with the glosses ad v. *Pro tribunali*, and ad v. *De plano.* It seems hardly necessary here to enter into the Roman law distinction between *iurisdictio* and *imperium.*—Cf. Donellus (d.1591), *Opera omnia* (Maceratae, 1830), IV, Lib. XVII, Cap. VI, §V, col. 1087 and 1089; Wenger, *Institutes of the Roman Law of Civil Procedure*, (revised edition, translated by Otis Harrison Fisk. New York: Veritas Press, 1940), see Index, s. v. *Iurisdictio, Imperium.*

disclose that the word *tribunal* is employed expressly as a figure of speech in juristic parlance, as noted in the foregoing quotation from Calvinus, to signify the administration of judicial authority.

The law in the Digest *"Ius pluribus"* states that the words *"ius"* (law) has several significations. According to one of them *"ius"* connotes the place where the *"ius"* is rendered or pronounced, this meaning having been transferred from the object which is accomplished to the place where this occurs (i. e., where the law is officially administered).[20] This figurative juristic meaning is clearly understood and explained by Donellus (Doneau, d.1591) with reference to the term *tribunal.* He states in relation to the law *"Si se"* of the Digest,[21] that the phrase *"tribunali praeesse"* (to preside over the tribunal) is a figure of metonymy, whereby the place (here the tribunal) in which judicial[22] jurisdiction is exercised is employed to designate the exercise of such jurisdiction.[23] In precisely the same vein Francis de Urrutigoyti makes *"tribunal"* synonymous with *"ius"* as referring to the place where causes are adjudicated.[24] He bases his doctrine upon the figurative language, mentioned above, in the law of the Digest *"Ius pluribus,"* the pertinent paragraph of which he quotes in full.[25] Hence, it follows that it is the official presence of the judge, the bearer of judicial authority,

[20] D. (1, 1) 11: "Ius pluribus modis dicitur. . . . Alia significatione ius dicitur locus, in quo redditur: appellatione collata ab eo, quod fit, in eo ubi fit. quem locum determinare hoc modo possumus: ubicunque praetor salva maiestate Imperii, salvoque more maiorum ius dicere constituit: is locus recte ius appellatur." Cf. also the gloss ad. v. *Ubi fit., loc. cit;* Wernz, *Ius decret.,* V, n. 313. Wernz-Vidal, *Ius Can.,* VI, n. 191.

[21] D. (5, 1) 1.

[22] Cf. D. (5, 1) 1; Donellus, *Opera omnia,* IV, Lib. XVII, Cap. VI, §V, col. 1087: "Iurisdictio quam in iudicibus quaerimus, de quo nunc agitur, est potestas de re cognoscendi iudicandique cum iudicati exsequendi potestate coniuncta."

[23] ". . . ideo quaeritur . . . quid sit tribunali praeesse: . . . Tribunali ergo praeesse dixit [Ulpianus] μετωνυμικῶς pro praeesse iurisdictioni: locus in quo iurisdictio exercetur, positus pro iurisdictione. Dicuntur autem praeesse iurisdictioni, qui propriam sibi habent . . ."—*op. cit.,* Cap. VII, col. 1099.

[24] *Tractatus de competentiis iurisdictionis* (Lugduni, 1667), Quaestio XX, n. 1.: "Pro vera resolutione huius quaestionis supponendum est, locum, ubi causae decidantur, appellari Tribunal, sive ius; ut patet ex l. ius pluribus modis. § alia significatione finali ff. de Iustitia, et iure [D. (1, 1) 11] . . ."

[25] Cf. D. (1, 1) 11, in fine.

which constitutes the tribunal. And likewise, that wherever the judge legitimately holds his session of court, there is the tribunal,[26] according to the principle declared in the law of the Digest "*Voluit praetor.*"[27]

This metonymic juristic meaning of *tribunal* is laid in both the decretal law "*Cum episcopus,*"[28] quoted in the foregoing, and in the language of canon 1636.[29] In other words, not only did Canon law, i.e., the law of the Decretals and of the Code, receive[30] the principles of the Roman law in respect to the place for the exercise of judicial jurisdiction,[31] but in particular the Code has with these principles retained the meaning of *tribunal* as denoting the judiciary, the active principle in the administration of judicial authority.

[26] Cf. Roberti, who indicates this thought by his insertion of *tribunal* and *iudex* in brackets, footnote 1: Cf. D. 11, 1, 4, §1: "—ius [tribunal] eum solum locum esse ubi iuris dicendi vel iudicandi causa [iudex] consistat; vel si domi vel itinere hoc agat."; et D. 1, 1, 11: "ubicumque praetor ius dicere constituit, is locus recte ius [tribunal] appellatur."—*De processibus* (2nd ed., Romae, 1941), I, n. 166.

[27] D. (11, 1) 4, 1: "Quod ait praetor: 'qui in iure interrogatus responderit' sic accipiendum est apud magistratus populi Romani vel praesides provinciarum vel alios iudices: ius enim eum solum locum esse, ubi iuris dicendi vel iudicandi gratia consistat, vel si domi vel itinere hoc agat."—*Corpus uris civilis* (ed. stereotypa quinta decima), Volumen Primum, *Digesta* (recognovit Theodorus Mommsen; retractavit Paulus Krueger. Berolini, 1928). And cf. gloss, *loc. cit.*, ad v. *In itinere*, and D. (1, 1) 11; Wernz, *Ius decret*, V, n. 313; Wernz-Vidal, *Ius can.*, VI, n. 191.

[28] C. 7, *de officii ordinarii*, I, 16, in VI°.

[29] "Quamvis Episcopus in quolibet suae dioecesis loco, qui non sit exemptus, ius habeat erigendi tribunal, nihilominus penes suam sedem aulam statuat, quae sit ordinarius iudicorum locus: . . ." It may be noted that this text clearly distinguishes between *tribunal* and the mere physical place where the *tribunal* is established. See the same distinction in can. 1770, §1: "Testes sunt examini subiiciendi in ipsa tribunalis sede." Thus can. 1709, §1 in the clause: "Iudex vel tribunal, postquam viderit et rem esse suae competentiae et actori legitimam personam esse standi in iudicio, debet . . . etc.," evidently uses the word *tribunal* as designating the active principle of judicial power in the sense of judge.

[30] "Manet in iure Codicis ius Decretalium, quod Episcopus in quovis suae dioecesis loco, qui non sit exemptus, possit erigere tribunal ad causam cognoscendam et definiendam."—Wernz-Vidal, *Ius can.*, VI, n. 193.

[31] Wernz, *Ius decret.*, V, n. 314; Wernz-Vidal, *Ius can.*, VI, n. 191; "Ius canonicum recepit ius romanum, et Episcopis agnovit potestatem iudicandi in qualibet parte sui territorii, . . ."—Roberti, *De processibus*, I, n. 166.

In the *Regulae servandae* the term *tribunal* is employed to designate, besides the judge, also the defender of the bond and the actuary in the aggregate.[32] The latter two persons are properly the ministers of the tribunal.[33] Yet, the fundamental concept of *tribunal* is retained in law as pointing to the judge as the active principle of judicial administration,[34] and postulates his presence for judicial procedure.

From the above considerations concerning the meaning of *tribunal* in present Canon Law, and because the procedure *Super rato* is judicial,[35] it follows that the oral examination of the woman, party in the cause, must be conducted in the usual manner of canonical judicial hearing and before, i. e., in the presence of, the judge (*coram Tribunali*), at the ordinary seat of the tribunal,[36] or under circumstances elsewhere, or in the presence of an official duly authorized according to the *Regulae* to preside at the taking of this deposition.[37] There is no exception in this respect to the procedure in the present hearing, in which, as in regard to the entire process, the delegated judge is charged with the duty of instituting a judicial investigation[38] as the presiding officer.[39] Hence, the term *coram Tribunali* (before the court) can not mean merely that the oral examination may take place *at* the seat of the tribunal by the physician in the absence of the judge.

Accordingly, it is evident that if the interrogation should be executed by the physician in the absence of the judge, or duly appointed judicial officer, whether this act be performed at the seat of the tribunal or elsewhere, the result would be a mere extra-judicial confession.[40] It would not be a judicial act. Thus, an informal questioning of the party by the physician in a visit to his office

[32] Cf., v. g., Reg. 13-15, 18, 19, 21, 23, 34, 35. The same use is seen, v. g., in can. 1621.

[33] As indicated in *The Code of Canon Law*, Lib. IV, *De processibus*, in the caption of Titulus III, Caput I, *De officio iudicum et tribunalis ministrorum*, as also in the *Regulae servandae*, Caput IV.

[34] Thus, can. 1609, §1 states: "Iudex antequam aliquem ad suum trahat tribunal et iudicaturus sedeat, videat utrum ipse sit competens, necne."

[35] Cf. Reg. 20.

[36] Can. 1636.

[37] Cf. Reg. 23-24; cann. 1570, 1770, §2, 2°, 3°, 4°.

[38] Reg. 20.

[39] Reg. 21.

[40] Cf., cann. 1750, 1753.

would not suffice to constitute a judicial act in the absence of the judge. It is, indeed, conceivable that exceptional circumstances, e. g., the refusal of the party for some reason or other to appear at the ordinary seat of the tribunal, may demand the execution of the deposition at the physician's office. To constitute a judicial act the presence of the judge would be required. If possible, the defender of the bond and the actuary must also be present, as demanded by the rules of procedure.[41] However, aside from the fundamental requisite of the presence of the judge to constitute a tribunal, and with no intention of an extensive exposition of the duties of the judge as such, a number of examples taken from the rules of procedure will serve to indicate, from a practical viewpoint, that the judge must moreover take an active part in the interrogation of the woman party in the cause, even though the questions are proposed by the physician. This necessary active co-operation of the judge will appear more clearly hereafter in the discussion of the questioning by the physician. It must be borne in mind that the judge, and not the physician, is the presiding official vested with jurisdiction.

The judge is required to be present in order officially to receive the woman as deponent before the tribunal, because she supposedly has been cited to appear before the judge;[42] otherwise, there can be no question of contumacy.[43] There is, in fact, no judicial appearance before any other person. The party can not be charged with an obligation, which results only from judicial jurisdiction, of appearing and answering before anyone else.[44] Aside from a particular consideration of the initial steps to be taken at this hearing, discussed hereafter, prior to the actual proposal of the pertinent interrogations by the physician, it is clear that the judge must supervise the performance of the judicial act as a whole. He alone has the authority to determine whether or not the deponent is obliged to answer certain questions.[45] Likewise, the presiding officer must

[41] It is not the purpose here to discuss the necessity of the presence of these judicial officers. Cf. by analogy or by way of suppletion in this case Reg. 24, §4, and the intent of Reg. 38, §2. This case raises an exception to the rules of procedure, in which, as in other cases of exception, see Reg. 99.

[42] Reg. 36.

[43] Reg. 26.

[44] Cann. 1742, §1, 1743, §1. See also can. 1773.

[45] Cf. can. 1743.

carefully follow the course of the interrogations by the physician, in order to ascertain that they are completely and properly proposed; whether they are correctly understood; and in order to note the necessity of additional questioning based upon the replies given, thereby to discover the complete state of the facts.[46] Hence, it is very useful for the judge to have before him his own copy of the questions. By the same token, he will take care that monosyllabic replies are properly avoided.[47] Also the judge will be attentive that the responses are properly and completely recorded in the acts.[48] A case in point is that envisioned in Reg. 44, §2 of the *Regulae servandae*. With reference to the answer of the party to a question proposed, which answer is, e. g., spoken in an incoherent or garbled manner—as may readily occur—it is there prescribed that the judge shall dictate the reply,[49] in a form, of course, which has the approval of the party deponent. The physician may, indeed, be instructed as to such and similiar contingencies. But he can not be presumed to be completely reliable in managing any such situation independently. He is not accustomed to judicial procedure, so that the immediate and discreet intervention of the judge may well be required. Moreover, it may be remarked both in regard to such instances and in general, that the physician can not be expected to apprehend the juridic significance and import of many of the replies. In relation to this matter, it may be observed that the defender of the bond may also have noted additional questions to be presented. It is submitted that the judge, not the physician, is the one who has the sole authority of admitting this further questioning,[50] because he alone is vested with judicial jurisdiction. Finally, the offices and resourcefulness of the presiding officer are eminently called for in the event that the present party deponent's deposition stands in

[46] Cf. Reg. 21, 31, 43, 50; can. 1775; *Instructio servanda a tribunalibus dioecesanis in pertractandis causis de nullitate matrimoniorum*, *AAS*, XXVIII (1936), 313, sqq., Art. 101 and 102 (Hereafter cited: Instr. *"Provida Mater."*) Articles of this Instruction will be found very useful for the conducting of the process *Super rato*.

[47] Cf. Instr. *"Provida Mater,"* Art. 129.

[48] Cf. Instr. *"Provida Mater,"* Art. 129; Reg. 44, §1.

[49] "Si verba referri non possunt, vel quia nimis praecipitanter prolata, vel quia impropria et inter se non logice connexa, iudex dictabit responsionem in actis redigendam."

[50] Cf. Reg. 28, 41; Instr. *"Provida Mater,"* Art. 101; can. 1773, §§1, 2.

serious conflict with that of the other party taken previously. New questions will have to be proposed in an attempt to expedite the difficulty, and it may be necessary, in the prudent discretion of the judge, to disclose to the present deponent the content of the previous deposition as made by the other party.[51]

When the necessity of proposing additional interrogations arises, especially if their number is fairly large and the matter is complex and of considerable importance, the judge may find it opportune to declare a recess of court for short period. During this interim the judge may consult with the defender of the bond and further instruct the physician.

The foregoing observations concerning the general juridic position and office of the judge presiding at the hearing of the woman party in the cause, will serve adequately, it seems, as a basis for a discussion of some items pertinent to the actual interrogation of this party to be conducted before the court by the physician. The employment of a physician to interrogate the woman directly, introduces an exception into the procedure. For the rule is that all questioning is to be executed only by the judge himself.[52] Some considerations regarding this exception will be the burden of Part II of this article.

JOHN R. SCHMIDT

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

[51] Reg. 55, §1; Instr. *"Provida Mater,"* Art. 114, §2.

[52] Reg. 41; Instr. *"Provida Mater,"* Art. 101; cann. 1742, §1, 1773, §2.

A QUEST OF THOUGHTS

Part II

TWO ATTITUDES

Under English law a man is presumed to be innocent until he is proved guilty. Under French law a man is presumed guilty until proved innocent. It may be argued that in a way these two attitudes reveal something of the essential character of the two peoples. It is the realistic and logical French—at least that is how the French are often described—who hold that the accused man is guilty. The English are shown as calling things other than they are and as saying one thing and doing another.

The French principle is the one that can most easily be defended by reason. If a man is arrested and thrown into jail or forced to pay bail, or if he is indicted and ordered to stand trial, it is because he is presumed to be guilty or known to be guilty. To be indicted and put on trial is itself a punishment for crime, whether real or presumed. It is contradictory to say that the man caught red-handed in theft and murder is still presumed to be innocent. The State institutes courts in order to convict the guilty rather than to exonerate the innocent.

There are, of course, cases where innocent men have been charged with crime, brought to trial, and wrongly convicted. Such things are or should be accidental and *praeter intentionem*. The innocent man on trial is treated like the guilty, but it is hoped that for both of them true justice will prevail.

A TRUTH AND AN ERROR

"What a man forbids he makes evil; but a good thing may be placed second to a better thing without being forbidden." St. Augustine, *Contra Faustum Manichaeum*, XXX, 6.

This is what people too often cannot see. Marriage is second to virginity, but is not therefore forbidden and evil. Nature is second to supernature, but nature remains good, not evil.

THE ATOMIC BOMB

A fear gnaws at the heart of America today. It is the fear that bombs worse than those dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki will be rained on us. President Truman, who thanked God that it was we who discovered the atomic bomb and used it according to His purposes, now asks that the bomb be outlawed.

Does not this fear spring from a sense of guilt as well as from a sense of danger? It was Americans who devised the bomb and dropped it upon helpless people already beaten into submission and pleading for peace. For this crime we must in time pay. For us, as for every nation that has chosen the path of force, the judgment holds: *All who take the sword shall perish with the sword* (*Matt.* 26:52).

WHAT HAS THE CHURCH DONE?

The question is continually asked in hate and derision. We preach, we teach, we build churches, schools, colleges, universities, homes for the aged, infant asylums, hospitals, refuges for fallen girls, and homes for wayward boys. We think and write. We exert ourselves in some way in every field and branch of human action. Yet all this is ignored or condemned and it is asked, "What has the Church done?" Worst of all, the question is asked at times by Catholics as well as by those outside the Church.

THREE SOURCES OF EVIL

Christianity warns us against three great sources and occasions of evil: the world, the flesh, and the devil.

Today we are told that Satan does not exist. He is denied, or laughed away, or at least ignored. It is folly or worse to fear an empty name.

The flesh and its ways are good. The body is to be pampered and indulged, not disciplined. The pleasures of sense can be regarded as good, even as the supreme good, rather than as in any way evil or an allurement to evil. The flesh is to be courted and used as what is good in itself, not feared as a danger.

The world, our world of men and things, is said to be the only world. Why should any man fear its glories, much less its goods and advantages?

What then is there to fear as evil or as a source or occasion of evil, if not these three? Yet evil remains and evils multiply. Shall we look for other causes and occasions of wrong? Or shall we think again of the world, the flesh and the devil, and return to older judgments on them?

CHRIST AND HEGEL

In his *Theologische Jugendschriften* Hegel wrote that "a state that made the attempt to live up to the commandments of Christ would go to pieces."

What would Hegel say today if he were to see the collapse of one state after another that had repudiated the ethics of Christ and tried to follow Hegel's own doctrines?

Elsewhere in the same work he says, "A love of man which is to extend to everyone, even to those who are not known to us and with whom we stand in no relation, is an empty notion."

Who is not my neighbor? Who is the member of the human race who stands in no relation to me? Who is the man that I can hate? Who is the man that need rightly show me no love and no respect, but only indifference and hate?

RELIGION AND SOCIAL ACTION

We have rightly condemned the Kantian (and modern Protestant) notion that religion is nothing more than good living. We know that if the doctrinal basis of Christianity is rejected, then Christian practice will be rejected as well.

We can fall into the opposite error. Knowing that we have the law, we flatter ourselves that it is being fulfilled. What is the case among American Catholics? We have allowed ourselves to become more and more individualistic in our religious practices. How many Catholics now visit the sick, or feed the hungry, or clothe the naked, or go to the imprisoned, in the literal way in which Christ meant that these things should be done? The warm personal, social virtues and practices of religion have in no small measure fallen out of the lives of both priests and people.

MARX AND HUMAN NATURE

The *Communist Manifesto* of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels describes the communist end—a Utopia among men—and the communist means to attain that end. If the communist doctrine as to

the production and distribution of material goods is put into practice, the classless society will appear, there will no longer be the exploited and their exploiters, and even the State itself will wither away. This earthly paradise will be brought about by changes from outside. Marx and Engels make no mention of any internal changes within the character and lives of men.

Never in all the history of human thought has there been such intellectual blindness as that shown by Marx and Engels in their manifesto. They show no sign of any true insight into the real nature of man, or of any recognition of his character, needs, and abilities as a moral agent. It is only by interior change and renewal that men can rise and improve themselves and others. It is only by the emergence of saints from among men that a change for the better will come in human society.

KILLERS AS HEROES

The publication of Hitler's address to his staff before declaring war on Poland is only an added evidence of his savage and lustful character. Giving orders to kill the men, women, and children of Poland, he scoffed at any adverse judgment of history. Is not Genghiz Khan only remembered as a great hero and empire-builder?

Unfortunately, as in so many other things he said, here again Hitler has seized upon and uttered an evil truth. He himself will rightly go down as one of the most monstrous killers of all time. But if he had won his war, would this record in history be quite the same? Will Stalin, whom Hitler admired and who has ordered more deaths than Hitler himself, be remembered other than as a great hero and empire-builder?

THE END OF ALL

Alternately men have looked forward with confidence to the coming of the millenium and with apprehension to the approach of the Last Day. Today we have thinkers and doers who plan to lead men into an earthly paradise. At the same time they are commissioning scientists to devise weapons that may end the world.

Can man destroy himself and his planet? It is asserted by some scientists that he can. The formula for the destruction of the human race and its dwelling place has already been written. It only remains to devise instruments that will start the destructive process.

Will man destroy himself and his planet? There are those who fear that he will. Yet in the end the decision remains not in our hands but in God's. Will He let us destroy ourselves? Perhaps yes, or perhaps He will only let this civilization of ours destroy itself, so that a better one may be wrought in its place.

In the meantime, if we are inclined to worry about the end of all things, it will be more profitable for us to remember that the end of all things is at hand for each of us individually, whether the atomic bombs are ever let loose or not. The universe is centered and ordered upon each one of us, with the result that this universe perishes as effectively for me when I die as if all things died with me.

THE OCCASION OF THOUGHT

Plato and Aristotle, and, I suppose, other Greeks as well, pointed out that philosophy begins in wonder. Schopenhauer in *The World as Will and Idea* rightly adds that this must be a wonder at the world itself, not at problems raised by other philosophers in their books. Fichte, he says, belongs to the class of false philosophers, because his own system was occasioned only by his perplexity at Kant's doctrine of the thing-in-itself.

Our wonder should not come from books. Still worse is it for us as thinkers if the books keep us from wondering. This can happen when we think that all the problems have been solved by the books we read, whether they be of Plato or Aristotle, of Aquinas or Kant, of Hegel or Marx. Unfortunately, this is what has happened to too many of us. Today especially there is too much school-thinking and too many party lines. The universe of things and of man has never shown itself so mysterious and awesome. But for all this, not yet have its wonders and terrors aroused us to acquire a new knowledge of things in their causes.

THE INEVITABLE OUGHT

In *The Prince* Machiavelli begins by stating that he will describe what great men actually do, not what they ought to do. But as the book progresses he shows that he cannot remain the recorder of bare facts. If a prince can invade his neighbor's territories, defeat him, destroy his kindred, and establish himself as king, then that is what the prince ought to do. So Machiavelli is not as original as he thinks himself to be. He is simply another advocate of the

basest of all moral theories, the doctrine that might alone makes right and that brute force alone is good and praiseworthy. He could not remain the mere reporter of and recorder of man's deeds; he became the moral philosopher but of the lowest order.

THE UNITY OF GUILT

When we read and hear of what has happened during and after World War II, and especially of such things as the Russians have done in Germany and behind the iron curtain, the temptation arises to hate and condemn the whole human race. Yet in a way this is not entirely a temptation. The whole human race, including ourselves, is guilty. We individually have no right to sit in judgment on men and condemn them. It is our duty to recognize that those who rape and kill are our neighbors and brothers, that we are bound to love them, that it is for both ourselves and them that Christ died, and that we are to pray to Almighty God for forgiveness for ourselves and for them. The Russians brought up in atheism may not know all the evil that they do. Perhaps it is a greater fault in us to be ignorant of the evil that lies within our own weakness, indifference, and inaction.

THE TRIADIC FORMULA

Applying philosophy to the doctrine of eternal punishment, Joseph Rickaby points out that the human soul is by nature a vast expansive force. When it rejects God completely, finally, and irrevocably it is left entirely to itself. Constrained within itself by the infinite being and power of God which it has rejected, these two opposing forces must needs blaze forth in a consuming fire.

Here Rickaby has made use of Hegel's triadic formula of thesis, antithesis, and synthesis, although he does not name it as such and perhaps did not advert to his use of the Hegelian dialectic.

We may apply the same reasoning to everlasting happiness. When the soul, this vast expansive force, is united with God, the infinitely good being that alone can absorb it, the result is perfect peace and happiness. The soul is a finite being with unlimited needs; God is that infinite good devoid of needs and desires which the soul needs and desires. The union of these two is perfect bliss. Thesis, antithesis, synthesis.

JOHN K. RYAN

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

REFORM AND INTEGRALISM

One of the most interesting and widely discussed books in recent years is Fr. Congar's *Vraie et fausse réforme dans l'église.* On the first page of his *avertissement* the distinguished author tells us that the present bulky (648 page) volume is only one (actually the fourth in his own logical ordering) of the eight essays he has projected to accompany his forthcoming basic treatise on the Church, *L'église, peuple de Dieu et Corps du Christ.*

Primarily the declared purpose of the present book is not to put forth a program of reforms which some individuals believe called for in the contemporary Church, but rather to study and fix the place of reforms, considered as a fact, in the life of the Church. The author sets out to show certain conditions which eventually render a reform necessary and those which make such a process possible without bringing harm to the Catholic communion itself. Actually, however, the book has been written with a definite "reforming" movement in mind: the movement which has brought forth, among other things, the body of teaching commonly known today as the "new theology." Fr. Congar is aware of manifestations of this movement in other European countries, notably Germany, Austria, and Italy. He is most concerned with its expression in France, and the third and last of the appendices which close this book, a chapter entitled "Mentalité 'de droite' et intégrisme en France," sums up the spirit and the conclusions of the entire volume and applies them to the present situation in his own country. The book was written and had received its *imprimatur* some months before the appearance of the *Humani generis.* Before the printing operation was completed, the encyclical had been published, and some of the *addenda* appended to the book refer to it.

Fr. Congar's introduction to his book opens with the observation that self-reform has always been an activity of the Church (p. 19), an observation which, incidentally, is somewhat dimmed by the author's subsequent criticism of the principle "Ecclesia semper reformanda" (p. 461 ff.). He continues his introduction by pointing out the existence of self-critical and "reforming" movements within the Church today, particularly in France. He believes that such movements were less restricted in medieval times than during the

modern era, and he indicates factors which have rendered such processes more or less suspect since the time of the Reformation.

In the introduction Fr. Congar also indicates what he considers to be four characteristics of this contemporary criticism of the Church from within. It is described as frank and even brutal (p. 39), as having a serious basis and structure (pp. 40 f.), as giving a great part to the laity (p. 42), and as involving a return to sources (p. 43). Incidentally, an *addendum* on p. 623 calls attention to the warning, voiced by the *Humani generis,* against any return to the sources conceived in a spirit of neglecting or despising the normative teaching of the Church's living *magisterium.* The author declares that, despite the fact that he employs the term "sources" in a broader sense than that which is found in the encyclical, his own manner of dealing with a return to the sources (*ressourcement*) is in harmony with the teaching of the pontifical document.

As causes of the contemporary movement, Fr. Congar indicates a modern taste for sincerity, which militates against meaningless gestures and statements. This movement has been occasioned by the upheaval consequent upon the recent war, and specifically, it has been brought into being by reason of a realistic view of the Church's situation in the modern world. Its point of application is to be found in the desire for true and meaningful expression and in the necessity to adapt or to revise some forms of the actual life of the Church.

The body of the book is made up of three parts. The first answers the question: "Why, and in what sense, does the Church reform itself?" It is composed of three chapters. The first deals with "The Church, its holiness and our failures." This section opens with a distinction between the old and the new points of view with regard to the problem of evil in the Church. According to Fr. Congar, ancient tentatives toward reform were invariably directed against sin, or against a sinful situation. In recent times, however, those who have set out to act as reformers within the Church have been faced, not only with the fact of sin, but with the necessity of combatting whatever appears to be insincere, and whatever is backward or narrow with reference to the movement of history.

This first chapter goes on to list some of the scriptural, patristic, and more recent Catholic statements with reference to reform

within the people of God. This documentation fails to be too impressive, however, since it refers to opposition against sin, rather than to the other factors which Fr. Congar obviously considers legitimate objectives of contemporary reform within the Church. In the course of this documentation he brings out some aspects of the very necessary distinction between the condition of the people of God under the old dispensation and that in which they have been placed since the ratification of the New Covenant. In this same chapter the author brings out two aspects of the Church, which can be considered as a mystery or an institution (something prior to the members who belong to it), and as a people or community. In the light of this distinction, he brings out four meanings which can be attached to the word "Church" in reference to reform. The Church can be looked upon precisely as a reality instituted by God, as a people composed of individual men, as the group of churchmen in charge of this society, and, in a concrete sense, in a way that takes in all of the previous meanings.

The second chapter of this first part concerns the ways in which the Church needs reform. Fr. Congar finds that such a reaction is requisite if the Church is to meet successfully the temptations of pharisaism and of tending to act as a synagogue rather than as the *ecclesia*. The first temptation, obviously, is that of formalism, the danger that the Church and its members may be betrayed into abandoning the essentials of Christian life in favor of the historic forms into which that vital activity is traditionally channelled. The second is the temptation not to follow the movement of the world. The author is convinced that a mere moral reform among Catholics would not be sufficient for the overcoming of this particular difficulty or temptation.

The third chapter of the first part is concerned with "Prophets and Reformers." It purports to show that the prophetical office, as perpetual in the Church, includes the works of "reformers" within the Church. The true "reformer" is depicted as a "prophet," in the traditional sense of the term.

The second part of the book deals with the conditions requisite for a non-schismatic reforming movement within the Church. These conditions, according to Fr. Congar, may be summed up in this way. The "reformer" must be motivated by a purpose which is primarily charitable and pastoral. He must take care to preserve

communion with all. He must be patient. He must act so as to bring about a return to principle and tradition, and not merely so as to bring about the introduction of some novelty.

The third, and the longest, part of the book deals with a reforming movement which did not have the characteristics described in the previous section, the Protestant movement. In this third part, Fr. Congar deals with the ecclesiology of the Protestant reformers, and with that of Protestantism, taken as a whole, today. He offers an amiably gentle adverse criticism of certain teachings which follow from this basic Protestant ecclesiology.

The vigorous conclusion of the book is devoted to a discussion of the definite problem of attitudes toward reforming movements. The author describes certain sources of opposition to these movements in general. He describes himself as optimistic about the contemporary movement in France. His attitude is based on his conviction that there is nothing modernistic or revolutionary in the movement, on the fact that many of the hierarchy have shown themselves sympathetic toward it, and on the fact that the men of the movement wish to be, and really are, children of the Church, animated by motives of pastoral charity. The danger of division within the Church (a danger which he does not recognize as affecting the Catholicism of France), is to be overcome by a kind of charity, through which the members of different groups refrain from criticizing and opposing views or teachings that differ from their own.

Three appendices close the book. The first of these treats of the modern notion of collective responsibility. The second speaks of two plans of fidelity within the Church. "Fidelity to the Christian reality can be a fidelity to the state (*l'état*) actually attained, to the actually existent forms of that reality; in brief, a fidelity to its present. There can also be a fidelity to its future, or, to put the same thing in other words, to its principle" (pp. 598 f.). The third and last of these appendices, by far the most interesting and important section of the book, deals with "The Mentality 'of the Right' and Integrism in France."

No outline of Fr. Congar's book can hope to give anything like an adequate notion of the intricacy of exposition and reasoning it contains. In part, of course, that intricacy is due to the genius of the author himself. No one, whether he likes or dislikes Fr. Con-

gar's contributions to the literature of sacred theology, can fail to recognize the boldness and originality of his thought and the profundity of his erudition. The intricacy, one might even say the involvement, of this particular work springs from another source also. The book purports to be, and was obviously intended to be, a sort of theological explanation of the place of reformation in the life of the Catholic Church. The author's personal opinions are so powerful, however, that they have insinuated themselves into the very fabric of his text, to the effect that we find in *Vraie et fausse réforme dans l'église,* not merely a theory of reforming activity within the Church, but a strong case of special pleading in favor of the men whom he designates as *les catholiques ouverts* and in favor of his beloved oecumenical movement. The principal shortcomings of the book spring from failings and inaccuracies in that special pleading.

The basic problem of the book is both legitimate and highly interesting. The underlying question is this: "What are Catholics, not placed in positions of ecclesiastical authority, to do when they find themselves faced, within the Church, by conditions which they regard as seriously detrimental to the good of souls?"

Fr. Congar, however, has given this basic problem a new twist. He contends that in modern times there are certain new failings within the Church which call for reforming activity on the part of its children, and particular on the part of the "prophets" or reformers within its membership. It is his belief that, up until the present day, the only sort of evil that men thought of removing from the Church was to be found in the sins of some of its members. On the other hand, he tells us (pp. 67 f.), "our contemporaries know a new field of scandal: that which the Church can give with reference to the movement of history in which the world of men is drawn. More than by the sins of its members, men will be scandalized by its failures to understand, by its narrowness, by its delays." The "movement of history" to which the learned author refers, seems to include the passage from the status that prevailed from the end of the Patristic times until the French Revolution, or until our own day, when men concentrated upon the objective aspect, up to the present time, when man has discovered the subjective.

The author gives us a striking example of the contrast between

the older mentality and the new. "St. Thomas or Albert the Great could write, like Aristotle: 'It matters little by whom or how a thing has been said. What counts is to know whether it is true or false.' The moderns, to some extent at least (*pour un peu*) would say: 'It matters little whether a thing be true or false. The important thing is the manner, the tone, the way they led to the statement (*le cheminement suivi*): it is to know by whom and how it has been said.' "

In other words, such is the mentality into which, according to Fr. Congar, the "march of history" has drawn the men of our time. And, since the men of our own era are supposed to be scandalized precisely because the Church is represented as failing to understand this mentality, and of being narrow toward it, the reforming activity with which this book is concerned is apparently to be directed against that very attitude on the part of the Church.

It must be emphasized at this point that Fr. Congar neither adopts nor approves the crass and naive subjectivism which he here attributes to the "moderns." Indeed, in a later portion of the book, when he has occasion to repeat the contention he voiced on this subject (p. 616), he states that this attitude is easily recognizable as "an exaggeration or even a malady of the judgment." He only contends that "a number of judicious and Catholic minds have thought that there is a certain truth in the point of view of the subject." He refers to Möhler and to Newman as pioneers in this respect.

Here, I believe, Fr. Congar has somewhat misstated the facts. Cardinal Newman, like many another Catholic writer of his time and since, was definitely interested in the subjective processes that go into the acts of belief and rational assent. But, and this is the important fact, he was definitely interested in the objective truth about these subjective processes. The interest in the "subjective" which Fr. Congar finds characteristic of modern thinkers and the interest in the "subjective" manifested by Newman were two quite different things. Indeed, the terms which serve to designate them should properly be called equivocal rather than even analogous. Yet, in Fr. Congar's writing, it is with reference to the "modern world's" interest in the "subjective," and definitely not with reference to Newman's, that the Church is said to be "narrow" and thus in need of reform.

In thus introducing this "narrowness" of the Church, this alleged inhospitality of the Church toward philosophies based upon the "new" mentality, into the group of factors against which a reforming movement is called upon to militate, Fr. Congar has beclouded the basic question that underlies all his treatise. Especially since the issuance of the *Humani generis,* we have had an authoritative instruction about what our attitude should be toward philosophies of this type. Catholic scholars should be cognizant of them. They should utilize them so as to gain an appreciation of the good they contain, and they should study them so as to be able to express Catholic truth more effectively to people who have adopted these systems of thought. They are not, however, to adopt these systems, and they are certainly not free to co-operate in any system of "reform" which would attempt to bring these systems into the Church on a plane equal or superior to that occupied by the perennial philosophy itself.

Much of the book's value as a tentative at solving the original problem has been lost by this inclusion of "narrowness" among the factors against which reforming movements should proceed. The various scriptural and traditional arguments which go to prove the need of real activity against undesirable conditions in the Church can hardly be expected to apply to circumstances which have never been thought of as undesirable until recent times. A great deal of what is involved in the area of what Fr. Congar calls the Church's temptations in the line of "pharisaism" and of "acting as a synagogue" turns out, on closer analysis, to be merely a wholehearted obedience to the positive law of the Catholic Church. The characteristics of a reformation without schism of which he speaks might well be the qualities of a movement opposed to the directions of the Holy Father and of the Catholic hierarchy as a whole, in the event that the narrowness against which the "reformer" moves is merely the narrowness of orthodoxy and the formalism he deprecates is an attachment to legitimate forms that have been imposed by divine or human ecclesiastical law.

The four conditions for a *"réformisme sans schisme,"* according to Fr. Congar, are these: a primacy of charity and of pastoral preoccupation in the intentions of the movement itself, an intention to remain within the communion of the whole, patience, and finally a genuine renewal through a return to the principle and to tradi-

tion. Ostensibly these are magnificent attributes for any movement, but, in the context of the book itself, some of the concrete factors thus designated are not entirely unquestionable.

Obviously any movement or activity within the Church should be motivated by charity, the love of friendship or benevolence for God as He is known in the light of supernatural faith. This faith consists in the firm and certain acceptance, on the word of God Himself, of the divinely revealed doctrine which Our Lord teaches infallibly within His Church. The charity carries with it inevitably an ungrudging obedience to the Church and a wholehearted affection for it: an obedience to the commands of our legitimate superiors here and now: an affection for the Church as it actually exists.

Should there be some sinful condition within the Church, seriously harmful to the good of souls for whom Our Lord died, it is obvious that Catholics are bound to pray and to work for the overcoming of that difficulty. Prayer, after all, remains the chief weapon of the soldier for Christ.

There is, however, one way in which such difficulty will never be found in the Church. There is a kind of practical infallibility in the society founded by Our Saviour, an effect of His indwelling within the Church which makes it impossible for any man to lose his soul or to offend God by following the actual laws and precepts of the Church.

Some of those laws and precepts are divine in their origin, are irreplaceable guides of Catholic life. There could never be any possibility of a legitimate reforming movement against these enactments. Other laws fall within the category of positive human ecclestical law. It is a part of God's provision for the Church that men can always save their souls and please Him by their obedience to these precepts also.

Now as far as this human positive ecclesiastical law is concerned, men are perfectly free to believe that it could be improved in its applications. Thus, for example, there is the law according to which the Mass in the Western Church is to be said in Latin, and there is the perfectly legitimate aspiration of some fervent Catholics for a vernacular liturgy. The aspiration itself is quite proper, but if any priest were to bring himself actually to say his Mass in the vernacular without the correct authorization, he would be guilty of serious sin. The movement for a vernacular liturgy is laudable as

long as it remains a prayerful activity which directs its pleas to the competent ecclesiastical superior and is scrupulously obedient to the directives actually in force.

It is definitely not enough, then, simply to think that some change in the human and positive enactments of the Church would be advantageous in order to justify what could be called a reforming action against the existent legislation. The binding force of this legislation is sanctioned by God Himself. It is a legislation which will and can lead men to heaven. But the human superior within the Church is responsible for it. It is part of his terrible responsibility that he will answer to God, not only for impediments which his own failings may have thrown in the way of his fellow-Christians' salvation, but also for any neglect on his part to give them the most effective possible direction to God within his power.

Applying these truths now to the problem of the language used in the saying of the Mass (and liturgy is one of the fields within which Fr. Congar envisions the existence of the present-day reform movement), we see that there are certain advantages and disadvantages that follow upon the use of either Latin or the vernacular. At present, in the Western Church, we are commanded to use the Latin. The obvious implication is that the leadership of the Church believes that this is the better course to follow. We have the guarantee that in following this direction, we are obeying Christ in His Vicar. We are bound to obey. If we feel that the other course is better, we can pray that it may ultimately be adopted, we may express our reasons and bring them to the attention of the proper authority. But we still must give our loyal obedience to the directives we have at present.

The second of the conditions which Fr. Congar depicts as requisite for a reform movement which does not end in schism is that of remaining in the communion of the whole. Unfortunately the many good things that Fr. Congar says in this section are somewhat beclouded by his teaching (in the second of his appendices), about fidelity to the past and the future of the Church, as distinct from fidelity to it here and now.

Even by itself, this "condition" has little immediate normative value. It would be difficult to find an heretical or schismatic group which did not believe and profess that its tenets and conduct were quite in accord with the true Christianity of the past, and which was not convinced that the Church itself would eventually catch up

with them. Likewise such groups frequently consider themselves to be in communion with "all true members of the Church" at the very time that they obstinately refuse obedience to their lawful ecclesiastical superiors, and ultimately to the Holy Father himself. The true test of any genuine "reforming" movement within the Church must be sought in its unfeigned and generous obedience and attachment to the men who are authorized to teach and command them in the name of their Saviour.

The third of Fr. Congar's conditions is patience. The fourth is "that there should be a renewal by a return to the principle and to tradition." This final condition, it seems to me, is not described in such a way that sufficient emphasis is placed on the fact that the Catholic comes in contact with tradition in the actual teaching of the Church's *magisterium*.

The most interesting and important portion of the book is the third appendix, on the subject of what Fr. Congar calls the "mentality of the right" and integralism in France. It is an energetic essay on the nature of that movement which the author finds opposed to his own tendencies in his native land.

Fr. Congar believes that this *intégrisme* has a certain continuity, and he is unwilling to think of the integralism of the opponents of Modernism (he names Cardinals Billot and Merry del Val) as something distinct from that of the opponents of the contemporary *catholiques ouverts*. He "does not believe that integralism is primarily a doctrinal position" (p. 605). He teaches that the principle of integralism is to be found in the joining, in some Catholics, "of their attitude of man-of-the-right and their Catholic fidelity" (p. 614).

> We believe that integralism proceeds from an attitude of the right. Such an attitude is characterized by a certain mistrust with regard to the subject, to the man, and by a tendency to stress the determination of things by way of authority. It is instinctively for what is done and defined, and what has only to be imposed and received; and against that which aspires to be, that which has not yet said all that it will be, and that which ought still to be sought. It has little affection for what comes from below, but loves that which is imposed, ready made, from above (p. 617).

Fr. Congar lists eight positions which result from the application of this attitude in matters of religion (pp. 617 f.), and four others

which characterize its application in matters of reform. His description of the opposition between the integralists and *les catholiques ouverts* in his own country makes interesting reading.

> So it has come to pass that, between the Catholic integralists and *catholiques ouverts à leur siècle,* there is a genuine distrust, nourished, I repeat, by the plot-psychosis [which Fr. Congar believes almost inseparable from the interrelations of groups, as distinct from individuals]. On the one hand the Catholic integralists always fear that the enemy will enter into the place by drawbridges that have been let down. They fear that the others are compromising with error, and they sniff around everywhere for the odor of heresy. The *catholiques ouverts,* on the other hand, warned by experiences that are far from being imaginary, always suspect the integralists of denouncing them to Rome. This, it must be well understood, engenders in them sentiments of distrust colored (*nuancée*) with a kind of contempt; a contempt which springs readily from the feeling that there can be found, among the said integralists, both an enormous ignorance of history and certain *a priori* [notions] which alone allow such ignorance. The integralists are sullenly conscious of this [attitude]. They are offended and irritated by it, and they seek compensation by redoubling their dogmatic rigidity, by distrust and by warnings (p. 612).

We must remember, of course, that the appendix with which we are dealing refers explicitly and primarily to conditions in France. Fr. Congar declares that all the integralists whom he has known personally have been men-of-the-right (p. 611). He also asserts that if one or another of these men has "evolved," he has found that the man "has not done this in matters of religion without doing it in the line of his political orientations, at least in the sense that he has ceased to abhor the Republic and 1789" (*ibid.*). Yet it is not for their political views or lack of them that the integralists have incurred the displeasure of the *catholiques ouverts,* and of Fr. Congar. The integralists are opposed because of their dogmatic rigidity, because they seem to be heresy-hunters, and because there is a prudent suspicion that they have reported certain teachings of the *catholiques ouverts* to the Roman curia.

The author of *Vraie et fausse réforme dans l'église* has very strong feelings about the last-named practice. He speaks (p. 608) of "the detestable habit, which some French Catholics have, of denouncing each other to Rome." He seems to forget that the Code of Canon Law obliges Ordinaries to submit certain books "to the

judgment of the Apostolic See." He likewise fails to take into account the fact that the same canon declares it to be the duty "of all the faithful, especially of clerics, of men who hold ecclesiastical authority, and of men who are especially well instructed, to report to the local Ordinaries or to the Apostolic See, books which they consider harmful." The canon goes on to state that this obligation is especially incumbent upon the Legates of the Holy See, local Ordinaries, and the Rectors of Catholic universities. Significantly a decree of the Holy Office, issued April 17, 1943 (and therefore within the Pontificate of Pope Pius XII), lists also the *doctores* of the Catholic universities throughout the world among those to whom the obligation mentioned in canon 1397, § 1, applies *peculiari titulo*.

It is difficult to believe that Fr. Congar had any other type of activity in mind when he spoke of denunciations to Rome on the part of integralists. Yet he makes common cause with *les catholiques ouverts*, who are represented as mistrusting and despising the integralists for something which is, after all, merely obedience to the strict and frequently repeated instruction set down in the Church's Code of Canon Law.

The religious position of the integralists is also represented as characterized by a rigidity of doctrine. All that this expression would seem to mean is a resistance to any teaching which the integralist regards as involving a change in Catholic doctrine. Certainly there can be little to stigmatize in this attitude. And just as certainly the designation of the activity of the integralists under these terms makes it difficult to see how Fr. Congar can believe that theirs is not primarily a doctrinal position.

One central argument of the book, and in particular one plea of this third appendix, would seem to run toward the conclusion that a Catholic who is not in a position of authority in the Church has no right to disagree publicly with the teachings and writings of *les catholiques ouverts* by alleging that the contents of these teachings and writings are not in accord with Catholic doctrine. That is certainly the inference expressed in Fr. Congar's conclusion, when he teaches (p. 574), that "a real and cordial communion among the faithful or spiritual families within one and the same Christianity would suppose that these faithful or groups of faithful would not set themselves up as judges or censors of each other, but that they should soon tend to see that their positions are mutually comple-

mentary." It is certainly the inference contained in the third appendix, where the integralists are represented as mistrusted and despised precisely because they have said that the teachings of their opponents were opposed to Catholic truth.

It is this combination of timidity and irritation which makes Fr. Congar's position so difficult to appreciate. He is convinced that the various theories and teachings offered in the camps of the integralists and their opponents perfect and complement one another. Yet he seems to be convinced that there is something evil in another man's declaration of his belief that they do not. He appears to forget that, if a man states or teaches publicly that some definite statement of another Catholic is not in accord with the Catholic truth, the accuser is expected to back up his charge. If he makes an inaccurate charge publicly, then he has automatically lost or at least seriously damaged whatever credit he may previously have had as a theologian. In the event that he should make such an incorrect accusation to persons in ecclesiastical authority, he has certainly lost the confidence of these men, even though his action will never be known by the general public.

And, on the other hand, when any man acts as a teacher or writer on theological subjects, he automatically lays himself open to criticism. It may well be that a certain amount of that criticism is motivated by unworthy reasons. It may well be that some critics oppose the books or the teachings of others within the Church because they dislike the authors or their associates. If they act in this way, they will answer to God for the sins against charity or justice involved in their conduct. Their inner motives, however, need not concern the authors they have criticized or the world of theology in general.

But, whatever his inmost motives may have been, if a critic should make the assertion that a definite statement is contained in a book, and that this statement is opposed to theological truth, and if anything like serious evidence should be brought to bear in favor of this assertion it is definitely the business of the writer thus accused to examine his own teachings. Where the accusation turns out to be accurate, it is his duty to withdraw and to disavow the error he has propounded. Where the accusation turns out to be inaccurate, it is his duty, or at least his privilege, to defend his own position. In any event, it is unworthy of the calling of a theologian to repel adverse criticism by alleging that the men who sponsored

it are trouble-makers, heresy-hunters, or, secretly or otherwise, adherents of an unpopular or dead political movement.

JOSEPH CLIFFORD FENTON
The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

FIFTY YEARS AGO

The leading article in the February, 1902, issue of *The American Ecclesiastical Review,* contributed by Fr. Vincent McNabb, O.P., is entitled "The First Eirenicon of the Twentieth Century." The "Eirenicon" to which the author refers is *England and the Holy See* by Spencer Jones, with a preface by Lord Halifax. Both Mr. Jones and Lord Halifax are in agreement that the primacy of spiritual jurisdiction in the Church of Christ was granted to St. Peter, and that union with the Apostolic See is an essential factor toward reunion. The book presents as a commendable principle the saying of an Anglican vicar: "Instead of saying that Rome is hopeless because she will not change, we ought rather to say that the fact of Rome's not changing is proved to be an abiding fact and must be reckoned with as such. In other words, instead of saying that our end is to change Rome, we should say that the starting-point of our enterprise is the fact that she cannot change. In the same way I should say that the proper function of the Anglican Church and also of the dissenting bodies is to change and to move, since this in fact is what they have ever done." . . . Dr. James Walsh contributes a lengthy article on "Mental Diseases and Spiritual Direction" in which he explains the influence on mental processes of mania, melancholia and "circular insanity." . . . Fr. McSorley, C.S.P., (still active in the sacred ministry) continues his study of "Hugh of St. Victor, Mystic," of whom he says: "ranked first among the scholars of his age, he was likewise venerated for a sanctity that his brethren understood to be far above the ordinary." . . . Fr. H. Thurston, S.J., of London, writes on one of the first works that appeared in print, the *Selen Würtzgart,* printed at Ulm toward the end of the fifteenth century. . . . In the *Analecta* we find a decree of the Congregation of the Inquisition, admonishing Ordinaries to take great care that the altar bread and altar wine be such as will leave no doubt regarding the validity of the Holy Sacrifice. . . . A correspondent in the Conference section asks how the genuineness of the candles sold as "wax candles" can be tested, and is told that "pure bees-wax will burn without any residue; where a residue occurs, mineral matter is present." . . . The Library Table contains an account of recent writings on Philosophy, Sacred Scripture and Theology. F. J. C.

Answers to Questions

BREVIARY DIFFICULTIES

Question: In reciting Prime during Advent is the versicle proper only to ferial offices or to every day during this season? Are the special antiphons of Matins said not only in ferial offices but every day when the psalter is read?

Answer: The special versicle, *qui venturus es in mundum,* is recited each day during the Advent season except when there is another proper versicle specified as on the feast of the Immaculate Conception and its octave. These special antiphons specified for Matins are said only in ferial offices, not when the office of a saint is recited.

MASS IN THANKSGIVING

Question: What Mass and orations are said when permission has been given to offer a solemn votive Mass of Thanksgiving?

Answer: When a votive Mass of Thanksgiving is permitted one is free to choose the votive Mass of the Most Holy Trinity, or of the Holy Ghost, or of Our Blessed Mother, or the Mass of any Saint that may be offered as a votive Mass. To the prayers of the Mass selected are added *under one conclusion,* the three special prayers of thanksgiving (collect, secret, postcommunion). These particular prayers are generally found in the Missal immediately after the *Orationes diversae.* The only other oration that is added to those already mentioned would be the *oratio imperata* and that depending on how it has been decreed in the diocese.

INCENSATION OF THE ALTAR

Question: Recently we were discussing the incensation of the altar during a Solemn High Mass. Do we give single or double swings with the censer?

Answer: Fr. O'Connell tells us that in incensing the altar or objects like candles, palms, etc., the single or simple swing is used. In other words the act of incensation is a simple *ictus* and between

each *ictus* there should be a slight pause to distinguish them clearly one from the other. He also warns us that the swings in incensation of the altar, both the table and the front of the altar, are straight swings and not a circular movement (*The Celebration of Mass*).

CHOIR REGULATIONS

Question: What are the Church's regulations about women singing in the choir? I was always under the impression that they were rather strict in this regard but many places where I go now I find women singing in the choir. Have these regulations changed? Are there any rules about non-Catholics being admitted to the choir?

Answer: As far as we know the general regulations have not been changed about women in the choir. The *Motu proprio* of Pius X was very specific on this point and still remains the *mens ecclesiae*. In strictly liturgical functions women are not allowed to form part of the liturgical choir either within or outside of the sanctuary. The Sacred Congregation specifically states (No. 4231) that "women may not form part of a mixed choir, of men and women, even when this choir is placed entirely away from the altar." A choir composed exclusively of women is permitted at liturgical functions only for a grave reason and the local Ordinary is to decide this matter and give the necessary permission. In many parishes these regulations are violated simply because of the lack of effort to organize a choir of men or boys and because the choir of women is the easiest and simplest solution.

Fr. O'Connell when speaking of the choir of men and boys points out that "non-Catholics may not be admitted into the choir (Holy Office, July 7, 1863; May 1, 1889)."

SACRISTY PROBLEM

Question: At the nuns' chapel where I sometimes offer Mass, I have several times been dismayed to find a reddish ring on the under side of the pall. This is unmistakably made by the species of the Precious Blood. Is there any rule or rubric which prescribes the times after which a pall ought to be changed and laundered? No doubt a bit of the sacred species may stain the pall on the very first day after changing, since the priest will naturally leave the edge of the chalice a little moist. But this rather large and some-

what deeply stained pall seems to indicate an extended period of use.

Answer: The Sacred Congregation while not specifying just how often the sacred linens should be laundered does warn that the lower part of the pall must be made of linen and easily detachable precisely to make sure that the pall is washed frequently. Common sense, good judgment and ecclesiastical propriety should be the guide in this matter. On March 26, 1929, the Congregation of the Sacraments issued an instruction binding in conscience all Ordinaries "to see to it that rectors of churches pay the greatest attention to preserving the cleanliness of the altar and its furnishings, especially those that touch the sacred species."

ANNIVERSARY MASS

Question: Several intentions have been given us for Requiem Masses for two deceased persons, whose names appear together. The donor specified that they be said on a certain day, since this is the anniversary of one of the two deceased souls. May we offer the Mass of the Anniversary on this day for two souls? If it is a day on which the *quotidiana lecta* is not permitted, but the anniversary Mass is permitted, may we say the anniversary Mass for both souls, in view of the fact that it is the anniversary of one of them?

Answer: Fr. O'Connell in explaining anniversary Requiem Masses says that "if an anniversary be celebrated for more than one person, it may be regarded as an anniversary in the strict sense if it is the real anniversary of the date of the death or burial of, at least, one of the persons." This statement seems to warrant offering the anniversary Mass our inquirer asks about.

LEONINE PRAYERS

Question: Does the celebrant conclude the prayers after Mass with the Sign of the Cross? What obligation is there if any to recite additional prayers that the Ordinary has requested to be said after the Leonine prayers?

Answer: We know of no obligation to conclude the prayers after Mass with the Sign of the Cross. Many liturgists hold that these prayers are not the concluding ones for the priest, since he is to recite immediately after the antiphon and the canticle. Keeping this

in mind he does not make the Sign of the Cross. We recommend to our inquirer the splendid article that appeared in *AER* for August, 1951, by Fr. Richard Brennan, entitled "The Leonine Prayers."

The Ordinary of a diocese may request a special prayer or prayers to be recited after the Leonine Prayers and all are obliged to conform to his regulation. We are not free to accept or reject this directive as it pleases or displeases our own likes or dislikes.

CHOICE OF OFFICE

Question: Recently, on the feast of St. Barbara, for a special reason, I decided to say her office and make it a double. According to the Breviary and the Ordo this feast was only commemorated. Later, in mentioning this to a fellow priest, I was told that I was in error about this. I argued that I was within the law since I was taught that in the seminary, if my memory served me correctly.

Answer: Fr. John J. Murphy in his *Practical Method of Reading the Breviary* tells us that "knowingly to change the office of the day for another nearly equal to it is no fault at all, if it rarely occurs (three or four times a year), and there is a reasonable cause, e.g., a special devotion, or charity." We are to keep in mind that we recite an office of equal length and not to say a *simplex* of nine psalms and three lessons in place of a nine lesson office. We are also warned that the choice of office must be from one's own Breviary.

MIDNIGHT MASSES

Question: Some of our priests offer their second and third Masses immediately after the Solemn Midnight Mass in Church. Is this practice permitted?

Answer: The law specifically states that in all religious or pious houses having an oratory where the Blessed Sacrament is regularly reserved one priest may, on Christmas night, offer three Holy Masses. Likewise, the faithful attending these Masses fulfill their obligation. The law, however, does make a distinction for parish churches. In this instance, only one Mass is allowed at midnight and for the priest to offer a private Mass after the parochial Midnight Mass, an Apostolic Indult is required.

WALTER J. SCHMITZ, S.S.

IMPROVING THE MORALITY OF TELEVISION

Question: What measures can priests suggest to their people toward improving the moral tone of television shows? Many of the programs present obscenities that are a danger to those who view them, especially to younger folks.

Answer: Unfortunately there is as yet no organized movement among Catholics for the purpose of preventing immoral television shows, similar to the Legion of Decency in the field of motion pictures. Certainly, Catholics should make some effort toward eliminating the objectionable scenes that television so frequently presents. Even some of the people in the television business have recently admitted that something should be done to clean up the programs, and have drawn up some kind of code. But until the patrons of television in large numbers voice their objection we cannot expect much improvement. Priests could aid considerably toward such a campaign by urging their parishioners to express their displeasure when they find that a certain program is morally objectionable. The most effective form of protest is that which is sent to the sponsors of the show in question with the assurance that his products will not be purchased until the undesirable features are eliminated. If a sponsor receives letters of this kind in great numbers, he will undoubtedly see to it that there is a rapid improvement in the moral tone of the program.

THE *ORDO* FOR RELIGIOUS

Question: A religious priest, whose Congregation has the privilege of following a special Ordo in the observance of feasts, is the pastor of a church. Should he follow the Ordo of his Congregation or that of the diocese?

Answer: The religious priest should follow his own Ordo in the recitation of the Office. As to the Mass, a distinction must be made. In churches confided to the care of religious in perpetuity or for an indefinite time, the Ordo of the Congregation is to be followed; but if the church is confided to them for a temporary duration, the diocesan Ordo regulates the celebration of Mass. Moreover, if a cathedral is confided to religious, the Ordo of the diocese is always to be followed (Wuest-Mullaney, *Matters Liturgical* [New York, 1944], n. 357).

THE ENDURANCE OF A PRECEPT

Question: If a local or provincial superior of an exempt clerical religious Order imposes a precept on certain members of the community in the presence of the other members, must those on whom the precept was imposed continue to observe it even after the superior's term of office is ended? For example, if the superior lays down rules for the clerical students, giving the commands in the presence of the priests and lay brothers, do these rules still bind the students, in accordance with Canon 24, even after this superior's period of authority has terminated?

Answer: Canon 24, to which the questioner refers, states: "Precepts given to individuals bind them everywhere, but they cannot be enforced by judicial process and cease with the expiration of the authority of the person imposing them, unless they were imposed through a legitimate document or before two witnesses."

The problem presented by the questioner is very complicated. The canon just quoted has been the subject of many different interpretations, so that a complete treatment of the question would be very lengthy. The following points, however, would seem to suffice for a satisfactory practical solution.

A precept can be given either to an individual or to a community. The command to which the questioner refers would seem to belong to the latter class, since it is intended for a group—the clerical students—and is meant to bind them as a group, even though the particular individuals change from year to year. The obligation to observe this command would, therefore, endure, at least as long as the superior who imposed the precept remains in office.

However, Canon 24 refers only to precepts given to individuals. Nevertheless, by analogy, it is reasonable to apply to precepts given to a community the norm for endurance laid down by this canon (cf. Jone, *Commentarium in codicem juris canonici* [Paderborn, 1950], p. 45).

The superiors of an exempt clerical religious Order possess jurisdictional as well as dominative power (Can. 501, § 1). When they issue precepts, they may intend to use only dominative power or also jurisdictional power. In a doubt as to which course a superior has taken in a particular case it is reasonable to conclude

that he has employed only dominative power (cf. Peska, *Jus Sacrum Congregationis SS. Redemptoris* [Prague, 1923], n. 298).

Now, it is more commonly held that Canon 24 refers only to precepts emanating from jurisdictional, not dominative power. Such, for example, is the opinion of Coronata (*Institutiones juris canonici* [Turin, 1939], I, n. 32). Consequently, it does not follow necessarily that a precept given by virtue of dominative power, even before witnesses (as was the case with the precept mentioned by the questioner), retains its force when the authority of the one who imposed it has expired.

The solution of Jone (*op. cit.*, p. 46) seems most reasonable: "Precepts given [by dominative power] to a community cease with the expiration of the authority of the one who imposed them, since dominative power, as a private power, rests only on the personal relation of the superior with the subjects." Van Hove says: "Since private power arises from a private relation, and cannot be extended beyond this private relation, it seems that such precepts cease with the authority of the one commanding" (*De legibus ecclesiasticis* [Rome, 1930], n. 359). He is speaking of precepts given to a community in virtue of dominative power. Of course, these may be renewed by the successor of the one who imposed them.

To settle all doubts satisfactorily, it would seem advisable for a religious superior on taking office to inform those subject to his authority just which precepts of his predecessor he wishes to renew, the understanding being that the others have ceased to bind. In this way those religious who wish to be most exact in observance will not be worried with the fear that they are burdened with a multiplicity of rulings coming down from past generations.

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

Analecta

The issue of the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* dated Sept. 18, 1951,[1] contains an Encyclical on the Rosary. In this Encyclical the Holy Father reviews the troubles which beset the world today when once again the blood of martyrs is being shed. Among the gravest troubles, he notes the current attacks upon the Faith and upon the innocence of the young. The Rosary, however, is still today, as it has been for centuries, a ready and simple means for fostering and protecting the Faith. The Pope, therefore, expresses an especial wish that the practice of the Family Rosary be everywhere restored, not alone as a particular form of prayer but also as a most effective training ground for Christian life and Christian virtue. The Rosary, he asserts, will be the great hope for the correction of the evils of our times. The Church does not rely upon force, upon arms, upon human strength, but relying upon the aid of Heaven it goes forward armed with the sling of David to meet unafraid its enemies. He recommends, finally, that in the minds of the faithful as they pray the Rosary there be always present those who are in captivity, in prison, in concentration camps.[2]

Two Apostolic Constitutions announce the raising of Prefectures Apostolic to the grade of Vicariates Apostolic. The first mentioned is that of De Dahr-El-Gebel in the Anglo-Egyptian Sudan,[3] the second is that of De Dodoma in Tanganyika.[4]

By Apostolic Letter the parish church of Our Lady of the Rosary and of St. Benedict "the Black," in the city of Paysandú in the diocese of Salto, Uruguay, is raised to the title and dignity of a minor basilica.[5] Likewise by Apostolic Letter St. Mary Goretti, virgin and martyr, is named a patron of the Sodality of the Children of Mary, of equal rank with St. Agnes.[6]

A Letter, in English, directed to M. Reverend Kilian Lynch, Prior General of the Carmelites, on the occasion of the seventh centenary of the Scapular, expresses the happiness of the Holy

[1] *AAS*, XLIII (1951), 577 ff.
[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 577 ff. (Sept. 15, 1951).
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 583 (April 12, 1951).
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 584 (May 10, 1951).
[5] *Ibid.*, p. 586 (Nov. 11, 1949).
[6] *Ibid.*, p. 588 (Nov. 25, 1950).

Father that the mortal remains of St. Simon Stock are being returned from their sheltered exile on the hospitable shores of France to their rightful place in the Dowry of Mary, to the home of his earthly sojourn at Aylesford.[7]

Another Letter, directed to Cardinal de Vasconcellos Mota, Archbishop of São Paolo, Brazil, makes mention of the Scapular devotion on the occasion of its seventh centenary. Presiding at the national Marian Congress the Cardinal is given power to impart a plenary indulgence to those present.[8]

Still another Letter, to Cardinal de Barros Camara, Archbishop of San Sebastian of Rio de Janeiro, appoints that prelate as Legate to the congress of the Inter-American Federation on Catholic Education.[9] A radio address, in Portuguese, made to this congress, calls the cause of Education, in last analysis, the most holy cause of the Kingdom of God. Its importance, says the Holy Father, is great at all times, very great in our own. Youth is "a hope," a hope for the family, for the fatherland, for the whole of human society, and at the same time it is a precious hope for the Church.

Youth needs physical education to strengthen the forces of the body. It needs intellectual education to unfold and enrich the capacities of the spirit. It needs, above all, moral and religious education which illuminates and guides the intellect, which shapes and fortifies the will, which disciplines and sanctifies conduct, and gives to the image of God a resemblance to the divine prototype which will make it worthy to be hung in the eternal galleries.

Education which prescinds from the moral and the religious aspects is mutilated in its greatest and best part. It disregards the most noble faculties of man. It deprives itself of the most efficacious and vital energies and ends by diseducating, by mingling uncertainties and errors with truth, vices with virtue, evil with good. The Holy Father notes with pleasure that today the better educators see this, and feel it, and try to make up for past defciencies. Nevertheless, he points out that as true morals and true religion are one so Truth is one. The fundamental and substantial truth is God. The revealed truth is Christ. The truth conserved and taught without errors or lacunae is the Catholic Church.

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 589 (June 30, 1951).
[8] *Ibid.*, p. 592 (July 6, 1951).
[9] *Ibid.*, p. 591 (July 4, 1951).

Education, the Holy Father points out, commences in the cradle and the first school is the home. He repeats the words of Pius XI in the Encyclical *Divini illius Magistri* lamenting the breaking down of family education. The first, therefore, and most serious obligation which is imposed upon the Catholic educator today is to supply for the deficiencies of education in the home. Another difficulty which the educator must meet is that created by the public school which does not form and sometimes even deforms the spirit. Added to this are the other occasions of moral and religious downfall which present themselves to incautious youth: bad books, indecent movies, even certain radio programs, as Pius XI also pointed out in his Encyclical, which Pius XII here quotes.

He, therefore, exhorts the educators to form youth definitely in the image of the Creator according to the prototype of the Firstborn of all creation and to temper it so strong that nothing will be able to deform it. If youth, when its education is finished, is not solidly formed, if the image of God is molded in material which is malleable, it is impossible that subjected to contrary forces and beaten by so many blows it will not soon be completely deformed. Such a deformation, after all, is helped by the child's own unruly appetites, by its passions which are not controlled but are left unchecked. The educators, therefore, should give to the youth the temper of bronze or of granite so that the continual batterings, the inevitable shocks of modern life, will not only not deform them but will rather serve to polish them and perfect them so that they will appear ever more perfect men, perhaps even saints who could be placed upon the altar.

Such was the education which aided Brazil in its infancy as a nation when the church was to be found beside the school and the one aided and completed the other. This it was which gave Brazil its characteristic traits and made it noble among the nations. It was this which raised up citizens who have deserved most of the Church and of the Fatherland, from the time the first degrees were given in 1575.[10]

Another Letter, to Cardinal Piazza, Secretary of the Sacred Consistorial Congregation, appoints him Legate to the centenary celebration at Catania in honor of St. Agatha, patron of that city.[11]

[10] *Ibid.*, p. 594 (Aug. 5, 1951). [11] *Ibid.*, p. 593 (July 30, 1951).

Another radio address, to those gathered in Catania for the celebration, points out how things have changed for the people there present, how governments and laws, undertakings and institutions, currents of thought and of culture, traditions and civilizations, are constantly undergoing change and nothing remains unchanged except the eternal, the absolute good. That eternal, here below, lies in the values for which St. Agatha is great and for which she still lives. These values are her unshakable faith, her heroic courage, and her passion for Jesus Christ. It is Christian virtue which is important, not what the world calls great, powerful, pleasant. Civilization consists not in the cultivation of the life of this earth, but rather in progress of the spirit. What the Christian world needs today for its restoration is spiritual leadership, a return to those moral and supernatural values, which men so often extol in the Saints and deny in their daily lives. The Holy Father, therefore, exhorts the faithful to a careful Christian conduct, sobriety of manner, and a courageous affirmation of the Faith for which St. Agatha reaped immortality in martyrdom.[12]

The Supreme Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office gives notice that Fr. Leo Seiller, O.F.M., as well as the directors of the magazine *Franziskanische Studien,* have humbly submitted to the decree of the Holy Office dated July 12, 1951 condemning and putting on the Index his work entitled *La Psychologie humaine du Christ et l'unicité de personne.*[13]

A decree of the Sacred Consistorial Congregation concerning the provisions of Canons 534, §1 and 1532, §1, 2° notes that the changed values of money have created difficulties in certain places and that the Holy Father has deigned to decree that while the present circumstances continue, and at the good pleasure of the Holy See, it will be necessary to have recourse thereto whenever there is question of a sum of money which exceeds 10,000 francs or gold *libellae.*[14]

The same Sacred Congregation declares subject to excommunication reserved *speciali modo* to the Apostolic See those in Roumania who have attacked Most Reverend Augustine Pacha, Bishop of Temisoar.[15]

[12] *Ibid.*, p. 599 (Aug. 15, 1951).
[13] *Ibid.*, p. 602 (Aug. 30, 1951).
[14] *Ibid.*, p. 602 (July 13, 1951).
[15] *Ibid.*, p. 603 (Sept. 17, 1951).

The Sacred Congregation of Rites announces the decision *Tuto* in the case for canonization of Blessed Ignatius a Laconi, confessor, a lay brother of the Capuchins.[16] It also announces the decision to accept the miracles proposed in the case for canonization of Blessed Anthony Mary Gianelli, Bishop of Bobbio, founder of the Congregation of Sisters of Our Lady of the Garden.[17] It announces also a similar decision in the case for canonization of Blessed Francis Xavier M. Bianchi, a priest of the Congregation of Clerics Regular of St. Paul of the Barnabites.[18]

On Sept. 14, 1951, the Holy Father received in solemn audience His Excellency, Dr. Nedyan Raghavan, Ambassador Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of India, who then presented his credentials.[19]

The Sacred Congregation of Rites also admonishes all those Bishops who used the faculty of celebrating the restored Easter Vigil and who have not yet sent in their report of the success of that celebration to do so as soon as possible.[20]

The Secretariate of State announces, among others, the following appointments:

Domestic Prelates:

Sept. 17, 1949, Rt. Rev. Msgrs. Joseph Segourn and Leo J. Thome, of the Diocese of Pueblo.

Jan. 11, 1951, Rt. Rev. Msgrs. Peter Gamache, Napoleon Gilbert, Michael Hurley, Thomas Laughlin, Edward Lessard, James McCooey, John B. Puchala, Maurice J. Redden, Joseph E. Vaccarest and Patrick E. Walsh, of the Diocese of Manchester.

June 21, 1951, Rt. Rev. Msgrs. Peter Flasch, John Grasser, Henry Riordan, Henry J. Schmitt, Stephan Studer and Constantine Wasniewski, of the Archdiocese of Milwaukee.

Secret Chamberlains Supernumerary:

Sept. 20, 1949, Very Rev. Msgr. George Biskup, of the Archdiocese of Dubuque.

Aug. 31, 1950, Very Rev. Msgrs. Thomas J. Halloran and Thomas F. Hayden, of the Diocese of La Crosse.

[16] *Ibid.*, p. 604 (May 1, 1951).
[17] *Ibid.*, p. 605 (May 1, 1951).
[18] *Ibid.*, p. 607 (May 1, 1951).
[19] *Ibid.*, p. 610.
[20] *Ibid.*, p. 610 (Aug. 1, 1951).

March 16, 1951, Very Rev. Msgr. Thomas L. Mercier, of the Diocese of Lincoln.

March 29, 1951, Very Rev. Msgr. Robert J. Donohoe, of the Diocese of Tucson.

July 23, 1951, Very Rev. Msgr. Joseph Clifford Fenton, of the Diocese of Springfield, Mass.

Secret Chamberlains Supernumerary in Cape and Sword:

Jan. 11, 1951, Mr. John Edward Swift, of the Archdiocese of Boston.

March 21, 1951, Mr. Luke Edward Hart, of the Archdiocese of St. Louis, Mo.

Aug. 24, 1951, Mr. Joseph Zachary Miller III, of the Diocese of Kansas City.

Commander of the Order of St. Gregory the Great, Civil Class:

May 20, 1951, Mr. Thomas Bradley, of the Archdiocese of New York.

Knight of the Order of St. Gregory the Great, Civil Class:

Jan. 11, 1951, Mr. Gervase T. Murphy, of the Diocese of Marquette.

April 5, 1951, Mr. Joseph Anthony Meninna, of the Archdiocese of Boston.

Commander of the Order of Pope St. Sylvester:

April 24, 1951, Mr. Vincent D'Elia, of the Diocese of Brooklyn.

THOMAS OWEN MARTIN

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

Book Reviews

ST. BENEDICT AND HIS TIMES. By Ildephonse Cardinal Schuster, O.S.B. St. Louis: Herder, 1951. $6.00.

The translation of His Eminence Ildephonse Cardinal Schuster's book on St. Benedict's life and times by theReverend Gregory Roettger, O.S.B., monk of St. John's Abbey, Collegeville, Minnesota, is an outstanding addition to Benedictine literature in the English language. In fact, as the late Abbot Alcuin Deutsch, O.S.B., points out in the Preface, this work is the only major biography of St. Benedict available in English today. Cardinal Schuster, a Benedictine, and the Archbishop of Milan, is one of the conspicuous scholars of our age, and has spent a lifetime in the study of his subject.

The sources for the life of St. Benedict are rather meagre. There exist only the second book of the *Dialogues* of St. Gregory the Great, written in the sixth century, and thirty-three couplets composed in honor of St. Benedict by Mark the Poet, one of the Saint's disciples at Monte Cassino. Neither of these works was intended to be a biography. The *Dialogues* of Pope Gregory were the simple narration of the most striking miracles of various bishops and monks of Italy who had been remarkable for their holiness. They contain no chronological data about St. Benedict, and whatever biographical items can be gleaned are merely incidental to the narration of the miracles. The verses of the monk Mark add little more than a few particulars relating to the agricultural improvements undertaken at Monte Cassino. But the learned Cardinal, with a wealth of archeological, literary, juridical, and liturgical knowledge, is able to fit the few disconnected facts about Benedict into their historical setting, and interpret and explain them in the light of the imperial and canonical sources, so as to give an amazingly complete and authentic picture of St. Benedict's personality, life and work.

The procedure of setting the miracles related by St. Gregory against the documentary background of the times answers indirectly but reliably a number of questions frequently asked about St. Benedict. For example, was he a priest? There is no direct testimony one way or the other by any contemporary. But Cardinal Schuster finds it a practical certainty that he was. Benedict's mission to Cassino to preach and convert the pagans and to transform their ancient temples into Christian churches certainly implies ordination. The jurisdiction exercised by the holy abbot, his threat to excommunicate certain nuns, the jealousy of the priest Florence, all confirm this belief.

Present-day advocates of a maximum autonomy for individual Benedictine monasteries will find weighty evidence for the other side to reckon with in Chapter XIII, which deals with the beginnings of the Benedictine institute. Cardinal Schuster maintains that it is beyond dispute that St. Benedictine anticipated by nine centuries the powerfully centralized organization of present-day religious orders, with which the largely independent local houses of the modern Benedictine family are in sharp contrast. At Subiaco, where St. Benedict laid the foundations of the Order, a number of abbots were dependent on a common superior general, and there was a common novitiate for all the houses. This was something entirely novel in Italian monachism. The juridical situation that obtained in Benedict's original institute was such a departure that it cannot be explained except by a special permit and mandate from the Roman Pontiff himself.

Certain cherished Benedictine legends will have to be discounted by those who seek documentary confirmation of them in Schuster's study. Thus the efforts of some historians to establish a blood relationship between St. Benedict and one of his first disciples, the boy-monk Placid, are based on untrustworthy sources. Similarly, the tradition of St. Maur's mission to France is without support, for Odo's Acts of St. Maur are not worthy of credence, since all verifiable data in that document are false.

St. Benedict's struggles with Satan, his energetic missionary activity, his liturgical work, the social contribution of his institute, and his posthumous cult all receive ample treatment. The numerous miracles recorded are all substantiated by the best authority of the time.

Several interesting chapters are devoted to Monte Cassino. The author tells the story of the great abbey's founding, the ancient military and political significance of the location, and the confiscation by St. Benedict of its pagan grove and temples. He traces the architectural history of the grandiose monastery that rose on the mountain summit. Fourteen of the twenty-seven illustrations in the book are of Monte Cassino, including photographs of the ruins after the bombing in 1944.

Besides its natural appeal to Benedictines, this new book should hold a wide attraction for all interested in Church history, the barbarian invasion of Europe, the present liturgical restoration, and the social mission of Catholicism. Those curious about the remarkable growth in this country of the contemplative life in the form of a strict observance of St. Benedict's Rule should read Cardinal Schuster's book and become acquainted with the courageous, human patriarch of monasticism whose "school of the Lord's service" has lured countless souls for fourteen centuries, and whose giant figure has "cast its shadow over Western civilization."

VINCENT SHEPPARD, O.S.B.

MEDITATIONS FOR EVERY DAY. By P. J. Sontag, S.J. Milwaukee: Bruce, 1951. Vols. I-II. $10.00.

Fr. Sontag's two volume work, *Meditations for Every Day,* is part of the "Science and Culture Series" edited by Fr. Joseph Husslein, S.J. The book has the aim of providing, especially for the layman, but also for the priest and religious, a series of meditations that cover the principal mysteries of Christianity celebrated yearly in the Church's liturgy.

Each meditation, and there are 369 in the two volumes, begins with several "preludes" which are intended to "withdraw our thought and imagination from extraneous, irrelevant matters, by briefly focusing our attention on the scene or some circumstances connected with the meditation." They usually paint the background scene of the meditation, a picture that can well be kept before the mind's eye in the beginning of the period of mental prayer to insure attention on the subject for consideration. The preludes are followed by a petition for the particular grace that is sought in each meditation. Then follows a treatise on the day's subject for meditation. This is the body of the prayer and is generally quite lengthy. Fr. Sontag suggests that a good aim in the spiritual life of a layman is to set aside one half hour daily for the practice of mental prayer, although for those who have less leisure, fifteen minutes might suffice. The body of the meditations in his book seems to have been composed with an eye to the half-hour goal rather than the shorter time. There is a danger that for one who has less than a half an hour for meditation, the period would become largely spiritual reading rather than mental prayer. This danger can be avoided, however, by prudent use of meditations.

Finally, the period of mental prayer concludes with a colloquy suggested by the author but which, Fr. Sontag says, "should be the spontaneous thought and affection, prompted by the individual person's needs and the matter meditated." The structure of the meditations in the book is that of the Exercises of St. Ignatius and is admirably fitted for beginners in the spiritual life. Possibly priests and religious who have been in religion for some time would feel somewhat constrained by the rigidity of the structure, but, of course, this would vary with each person.

The body of the meditation itself is particularly good for laymen. It treats in a matter of fact, yet devotional, way, without any excessive sentimentality, the great truths of our religion. There is an ample sprinkling of meditations on the lives and virtues of the saints to bring truths that can be somewhat abstract into the real and even personal order, so that one is prompted to ask for the virtues of the saint rather than just to think about them. There are a sufficient number

of references to scripture texts and, interestingly enough, to papal documents, to give authority and force to the points made in the meditations. The general tenor of the meditations is informative. The subject is explained quite thoroughly, in the terminology of modern America, and with an overtone of devotion that is somewhat contagious. There are few who, with God's grace, would not emerge better informed and furthered on the way to perfection by regular use of this book for daily mental prayer. It is probably true that laymen would profit more from it than would religious, however; but this, after all, was the intention of the author.

It is interesting and rather encouraging to see such a book available for directing the spiritual lives of modern educated Catholic laymen. The spiritual life of the layman is something that has been too long neglected in America. The time is fast approaching and is even now upon us when we must supply modern America with more first class spiritual books. Fr. Sontag's book is definitely a step in this direction. It has the advantage of being written for modern laymen by one who obviously is conscious of their needs and aspirations. It is permeated by an apostolic spirit that is the fruit of charity, the love of God.

Love of God depends on our knowledge of Him. It is in supplying this knowledge of God, as it is expressed in the feasts of the Church during the year, in her principal dogmas, her sacraments and sacramentals, etc. that Fr. Sontag's book is pre-eminent. Love follows upon knowledge. It is knowledge that *Meditations for Every Day* does much to increase. Regular use of it, then, in loving contemplation of God will do much to dispose the layman to "do the truth in charity in order that we may in all things grow up in Him who is the head, the Christ."

JOHN P. WHALEN

ELIZABETH BAYLEY SETON, 1774-1821. By Annabelle M. Melville. New York: Scribner's, 1951. Pp. xvii + 411. $4.00.

In spite of a recent trend of hagiographers to sift through legend and winnow out facts, it is still a refreshing experience, and almost novel, to read the life of a woman whose cause for beatification is now under consideration and not be repulsed by an accumulation of half-truths and an inflation of virtue and achievement with scant basis in fact. Happily, Annabelle Melville has avoided all such imaginings and has used with skill all the tools of historical research to piece together a highly authentic picture of Mother Seton.

Opening with a chapter on "The Bayleys and Setons of New York," Miss Melville unfolds the backdrop or *mise-en-scène* that Msgr. Peter Guilday used to say was so vital to perspective and evaluation of an historical personage. All through this study Miss Melville is alert to

sketch in the signicant events of history that surrounded Mother Seton: the war of 1812, the British blockade of the Chesapeake and Delaware Bay, the Napoleonic forays that affected the Sisters of Charity and the Sulpicians in France, and the internal administration of the infant Church under Archbishops Carroll and Marechal. In fact here are excellent studies of such early spiritual giants as Bruté, Carroll, Cheverus, Dubois, Dubourg, Flaget, Marechal, Matignon, and Tessier. Indicative of Mother Seton's stature is the fact that in some way or other they all entered her life and ventures.

It was Archbishop Carroll who took an early interest in Mrs. Seton, discouraged her intention to go to Montreal to enter a convent, and remained a confidant and counsellor until his death in 1815. William Dubourg and the Sulpicians offered Mother Seton the house on Paca Street in Baltimore, still standing, which was to be her residence for a year and the stepping-stone to her establishment of the community at Emmitsburg. It was Francis Matignon who was able to foresee that Mrs. Seton was "destined to take a great place in the United States." But of all the early churchmen who entered into Mother Seton's life, she herself had the greatest devotion for Bruté, Dubois, and Babade.

Miss Melville gives a documented report on the development of the first native sisterhood in the United States, carefully analyzing the reasons that led to the revision of the Rule of the French Sisters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul that was used as a basis for the constitution of the new Sisters of Charity of St. Joseph. But while Mother Seton is shown as the prudent superior of her fledgling community, she also looms as a devoted mother and widow with five children. The early portions of Miss Melville's study are a sympathetic picture of Elizabeth Bayley, the young maiden of New York, Mrs. William Seton, the matron of New York, and then Elizabeth Seton, bereaved widow with the Filicchi family in Italy.

The Filicchis were a determining factor in the conversion of Mrs. Seton. It was the Catholic atmosphere of their family life in Leghorn that fired Mrs. Seton's interest in the Catholic Church. After William died, Antonio Filicchi was extremely generous to the widow Seton and upon her return to the States gave her *carte blanche* to his bank account. Miss Melville adroitly handles this relationship and is especially discerning in her analysis of the vacillation and uncertainty of Mother Seton's mind before she was finally received into the Church by Fr. Matthew O'Brien in New York.

In so searching a study as Miss Melville has made, it comes as something of a surprise that so few reasons have been uncovered for the tragic failure of William's business. Again, there is not even mentioned the possibility of Elizabeth's remarriage after the early

demise of William. The fervent correspondence between Antonio Filicchi and Elizabeth Seton must post the inevitable question of whether there was ever the offer of marriage.

However, Miss Melville's loyalty to the facts as she uncovered them in all the extant letters, diaries, and other materials found in the archives of chanceries, universities, and the Emmitsburg mother-house of the Sisters of Charity of St. Joseph undoubtedly kept her from creating answers out of mere surmise and imagination.

It is interesting to note that in a book of 411 pages, only 299 are actual text. The remainder is devoted to copious notes and an extensive bibliography. This fact alone is a measure of the objective scholarship and tireless research that have been invested in this project. As the Most Reverend John McNamara, Auxiliary Bishop of Washington, D. C., remarks in the foreword: ". . . the result of her [Miss Melville's] painstaking and exhaustive research is a storehouse of helpful and reliable information which no future historian can afford to by-pass in his quest for knowledge of the Foundress of the Sisters of Charity in the United States."

FRANCIS X. CANFIELD

AN INTRODUCTION TO ANCIENT PHILOSOPHY. By A. H. Armstrong. Westminster, Md.; The Newman Press, 1949. Pp. xvi + 241, with index. $3.25.

Some introductions to philosophy are like masters-of-ceremonies who eloquently present themselves. Instead of the student meeting the illustrious great of the past or at least being encouraged to look at their reflections in their own literary remains, he gets only more or less scholarly distillations. To a certain extent, of course, this cannot be avoided and too much objection should not be made provided the author stimulates the student to get at the material himself and provides the references he needs. Even so we must remind ourselves that reading *about* philosophers is no substitute for reading them. This is still the preferred way, not only for the sake of what they have to say but even more so for making contact with their spirit. That is not likely to be communicated by even the choicest snatches of their writings or the most impeccable paraphrasing. The reader must break through the crust of commentary and interpretation to experience the reality of these intellectual giants. Otherwise he meets only vapid abstractions.

This probably sounds more forbidding and harshly critical than it is meant to; for anyone who knows what an author of an introduction to philosophy faces will have immense sympathy for his efforts, and the more elementary the treatise the worse his difficulties—a fact which has special application to the present book. It grew out of a series of

lectures delivered in England at the Newman Association in 1943, with rather a special objective. They did not aim to give merely a survey of ancient philosophy but rather to be part of a history of philosophy course, going along with a systematic exposition of scholastic philosophy. As Professor Armstrong says, his work was conceived first and foremost as a historical introduction to the *philosophia perennis*.

This is why he stops with, but includes, St. Augustine, taking him as the point of connection between Hellenic philosophy and the philosophy of the Latin Middle Ages. Moreover, Augustine more than any one else is responsible for carrying out the great work of "transforming Platonic-Aristotelian metaphysics into a system of thought appropriate to the Christian revelation." "Transformation" is a strong word to describe Augustine's share in transmitting Greek philosophy, especially as including Aristotle and Aristotelian-inspired doctrines. It is hard to reconcile this (p. xvi) with what the author says later, that "the only Hellenic philosophy which permanently influenced Augustine was the Platonism of Plotinus" (p. 207). This, of course, is correct; but it apparently severs Augustine from Aristotle, and leaves us wondering why the author speaks of Augustine transforming what he calls Platonic-Aristotelian metaphysics.

At any rate, the Bishop of Hippo closes the sketch, as the author calls it, which begins with the early Ionians, Thales, Anaximander, and Anaximenes. I suppose some may object to Augustine's being considered the last of the ancients, but scarcely any will challenge Thales as the starting point of philosophy in the western world. The seventeen chapters in between run through Socrates and his classical predecessors, on to Plato, with three chapters, and Aristotle, who outdistances him with four. This accounts for half of the book. Hellenistic philosophies, Rome and the revival of Platonism, beginnings of Christian philosophy carry the reader on to Tertullian and the school of Alexandria, to Plotinus (two chapters) and the Neo-Platonists, and so to Augustine and to what Professor Armstrong calls the "transmutation of ancient thought."

In all this there is no claim to original research nor evidence of any startling discoveries or novel interpretations. The author says that he set out to write a short and elementary sketch; and on this basis his work should be judged. He does not say that he intended to produce a text of ancient philosophy, but his work might easily serve that purpose. By selection and arrangement of material, by his style at once simple and adequate and lively, by chapter summaries, and other such student-aids as a list of dates, analysis of sources, short book list and an ample index, he has achieved a book which should prove extremely useful to beginners in the field of philosophy.

They are urged, moreover, to go to the philosophers themselves, to prove and supplement what must be the inadequacies of any introduction. Yet it is on this point that I must express some disappointment with Professor Armstrong's book. References are all too few. The short book list, with its selective citations of works and translations, helpful as it is bound to be, does not give what the more inquisitive student must have if he is going to use the sources. Perhaps the author feared that references might pile up and be distasteful or spoil the continuity of the text. Without a doubt some and perhaps many readers would prefer the elimination of notes. But on this score I like to recall Étienne Gilson's reply in his Héloise and Abélard: "Here, then is a little book full of notes. They are no pledge of its style, but they are of its honesty."

Judged on the criterion, that an introduction to the history of philosophy should bring reader and philosopher together, Professor Armstrong's effort leaves something to be desired. It is not a book for the research student nor does it challenge comparison with such works as Copleston's *A History of Philosophy*. This is, perhaps to put it on the wrong level. But considered in the light of its special purpose, it is really a noteworthy contribution, and if not used as a text ought to be on the young philosopher's list of required reading. It can also be recommended to the general reader as an excellent snyopsis of a complex but critically formative segment of western culture. It is readable, unobtrusively solid, understandable, written with considerable enthusiasm, chary of controversy and a tribute to the author's erudition and mastery of the vast field.

This is no more than what might be expected from a man of Professor Armstrong's background and attainment. Since he is not well known in this country, perhaps I may conclude with a few items about him. An Englishman, born in 1909, he studied at Jesus College, Cambridge, from 1928 to 1932, where he took his Master's degree in 1935. After various teaching and research posts at Cambridge and Swansea, he was appointed to the chair of Latin Literature and Classical Greek in the Royal University of Malta, which he held until 1943, when he suffered a breakdown due to the siege conditions of 1942. At present Professor Armstrong is senior lecturer in Latin at University College, Cardiff. He has written *The Architecture of the Intelligible Universe in the Philosophy of Plotinus* (1940) and has contributed to *The Clerical Quarterly, Mind, The Downside Review, Dublin Review*. He has also done some patristic studies on Augustine and St. Gregory of Nyssa for the *Eastern Churches Quarterly* and *Dominican Studies*. He is married, has five children and was received into the Church in 1932.

JOSEPH B. MCALLISTER